

THE AMERICAN ✠ CHURCH ✠ MONTHLY

Selden Peabody Delany, D. D., Editor

July 1919

20 Cents

Vol. 5 No. 5

Editorial Comment	-	-	-	927
Theology and Education	-	-	-	938
<i>The Bishop of Pennsylvania</i>				
The Danger in the Proposed Canon	-	-	-	948
<i>A Presbyterian of the Church</i>				
The Philosophical Necessity	-	-	-	956
<i>Ralph Adams Cram</i>				
Sarah Frances Smiley	-	-	-	984
<i>Mrs. Harlan Cleveland</i>				
The Morality of Interest	-	-	-	997
<i>Herbert Parrish</i>				
The Implications of an Ancient Rhyme	-	-	-	1002
<i>Henry S. Whitehead</i>				
The Inner Life of the Clergy	-	-	-	1010
<i>Edwin S. White</i>				
Book Reviews	-	-	-	1018

Entered as second-class matter at the Post Office, New Brunswick, N. J., under Act of March 3, 1897

Issued by the TEMPLE PUBLISHING CO., 42 Albany Street
New Brunswick, New Jersey

EDWIN S. GORHAM, Business Manager

11 West 45th Street

New York

Prepare for General Convention by reading THE LIVING CHURCH Special Offer

To persons not now on the subscription list (clerical or lay) we will send the paper for SIX MONTHS for

ONE DOLLAR

This will include the issues that discuss General Convention topics in advance and also those containing the

FULL REPORTS OF GENERAL CONVENTION

which we expect to be better than ever before.

A series of papers by the Rev. H. B. St. George, D.D., to be commenced in June, will discuss the subject of PRAYER BOOK REVISION, in which Dr. St. George is an expert. Topics relating to Church Unity will be discussed by Churchmen of distinction.

THIS SPECIAL OFFER

is made in the hope that in many parishes the rector, or some layman, will raise a sufficient sum to send the paper for that period of time to all the INTELLIGENT, THOUGHTFUL members of the parish. The special rate cannot be extended beyond the trial period because IT COSTS US MORE THAN THAT TO MAKE THE PAPER.

Intelligent Churchmanship can only be built up by promoting intelligence in the problems of Churchmanship. And an enthusiastic constituency for Missions and for all Church activities depends upon the increase of intelligent Churchmanship. The Church lags, not because her people lack for money, but because they lack knowledge of and interest in the Church and her many activities.

Compare the Churchmen who read THE LIVING CHURCH with those who do not. That is a sufficient test of the value of the paper.

MOREHOUSE PUBLISHING CO.
MILWAUKEE, WIS.

BOOKS FREE FOR THE POSTAGE TO MINISTERS, STUDENTS FOR THE MINISTRY, AND FOREIGN MISSIONARIES

BY EMANUEL SWEDENBORG

Any or all of the following three cloth-bound volumes will be forwarded to any minister, theological student, or foreign missionary, who will send us 15c. to cover mailing cost for each book, without further cost or obligation of any sort.

ARCANA CŒLESTIA, VOL. 1.

Takes up the first nine chapters of Genesis, verse by verse, and brings out the eternal or spiritual meaning that lies within the literal story. It helps greatly in making clear the account of the Creation, of the Garden of Eden and of the Flood, and strengthens one's belief in the Holy Bible as the very Word of God.

855 pages. Postage, 15 cents.

HEAVEN AND ITS WONDERS, AND HELL

Gives a clear and rational explanation of the nature of death, of man's entrance into the spiritual world, and of the organization of that world and of the life therein.

These presentations are in harmony with the teachings of Holy Scripture.

350 pages. Postage, 15 cents.

DIVINE LOVE AND WISDOM

Treats of the creation of the universe. Explains the trinity in God.

277 pages. Postage, 15 cents.

We act as Distributing Agents for these books, and can unreservedly recommend them as of great value in your work. In order to secure these books enclose currency or stamps and address Department B.

J. B. LIPPINCOTT COMPANY

EAST WASHINGTON SQUARE

PHILADELPHIA

THIRD EDITION

The New Hymnal

with both words and music

Heretofore congregational singing has been almost out of the question. Its far-reaching effects have been lost.

The action of the Church in authorizing the NEW CHURCH HYMNAL has at last placed within the reach of all parishes the means for developing that inspiring medium which is lacking in our Church alone.

Price to Churches, \$1.05 a copy and carrying charges.

5 per cent with order.

5 per cent upon delivery.

10 per cent monthly thereafter for nine months.

These terms apply to orders of 100 copies and upward received directly. Small parishes may secure the benefit of these terms by placing orders through their Diocesan Committee of the Church Pension Fund.

THE CHURCH HYMNAL CORPORATION

Care of The Church Pension Fund

14 Wall Street

New York

CONTRIBUTORS FOR JULY

A Presbyterian of the Church appeared in the *Monthly* of September, 1918, in "The Church: the Report of a Misgiving."

Dr. Ralph Adams Cram is the prominent architect of Boston who is also widely known as an author.

Mrs. Harlan Cleveland is active in Church work, especially the Woman's Auxiliary, and resides in New York City.

The Rev. Herbert Parrish is the rector of Christ Church, New Brunswick, New Jersey.

The Rev. Henry S. Whitehead is Pastor of the Children, Church of S. Mary the Virgin, New York City.

The Rev. Edwin S. White is the rector of S. Paul's Church, Aurora, New York.

The American Church Monthly

*A Magazine of comment, criticism and review dealing
with questions confronting the Anglican Communion
and more especially the Church in the United States*

TEMPLE PUBLISHING CORPORATION

President: GEORGE A. ARMOUR, Princeton, N. J.

Vice-President: GUY VAN AMRINGE, 55 Liberty Street, New York

Secretary: THE REV. CHARLES C. EDMUNDS, D.D., 6 Chelsea Square, New York

Treasurer: HALEY FISKE, 1 Madison Avenue, New York

Two Dollars a Year

Canadian subscription, \$2.25 a Year

Twenty Cents a Copy

Foreign subscription, \$2.50 a Year

Volume V

JULY, 1919

Number 5

The Pope and Christian Unity

THE Associated Press report that the Vatican has declined to send representatives to the World Conference on Faith and Order was an item of news that meant little to people in general, but was of unusual interest to those who knew the inside facts.

About ten years ago the General Convention of the Episcopal Church appointed a Commission to arrange for a world-wide conference on Faith and Order. To this conference all Christian bodies in the world which acknowledge Christ as God and Saviour were to be invited to send representatives. The purpose of the conference was to

enable the various communions in Christendom to come together in order that they might declare what beliefs they considered essential and irreducible, and also what beliefs and practices they would be willing to surrender for the sake of reunion with all other Christians. It was felt that if a conference of this sort could be arranged, many of the obstacles to reunion might be removed and each group of Christians would have a better understanding of the theological convictions of other groups. At the inception of this movement the late J. P. Morgan was keenly interested in the project, and contributed generously toward the expenses of the Commission. It was largely through the money he gave that the Commission has been able to make the world-wide canvass which has thus far resulted in deputations being appointed by almost all of the communions of Christendom except the Roman Catholic Church. The recent visit to the Pope of the deputation appointed by the Commission was the culmination of this canvass and ended in disappointment. The deputation was indeed received most cordially by the Holy Father; but he told them that it was not possible for his Church to take part in the proposed world conference. The Papal Secretary of State, Cardinal Gasparri, said: "Rather than the reunion of the Christian Churches, the Holy See aims at the unity of the Church, which, in the opinion of Rome, can only occur by all returning to the Catholic Church."

There are two general movements among Christians to-day looking towards the elimination of their ecclesiastical divisions and the more efficient unification of their spiritual energies. One of these is the movement called Federation, which aims at associating all Christian denominations in common work for social and civic betterment and for the moral improvement of the race. In this movement, how-

ever, no attempt is made to induce all Christians to accept a common creed or unite in a common worship. Such unity is regarded as either undesirable or Utopian. The other movement aims at nothing short of organic unity, and is based on the conviction that the Christian Church which is professedly the mystical Body of Christ should be one and undivided, with one faith, on baptism, and one indwelling Spirit. The former movement is being propagated vigorously in this country by the Federation of Churches, while the latter movement has been advocated chiefly by the Commission on Faith and Order of the Episcopal Church.

At present only two methods of achieving the organic reunion of Christendom are being seriously considered. One is the method which has been proposed by the Commission on Faith and Order, namely, the calling together of representatives of all Christian creeds for the purpose of conference and a better mutual understanding of one another's position. If, for example, representatives of the Roman Catholic Church were permitted to come to such a conference and state plainly just what are the claims made by the Pope to be the supreme ruler of the Church, it is quite conceivable that many Protestants would admit that they had heretofore misunderstood those claims and would in the future be more disposed to accept them. On the other hand, if certain Protestant denominations could in such a conference explicate their conception of the Christian ministry as an exercise of the prophetic function, it is quite possible that Catholic theologians might admit that there was a place for a prophetic order in the reunited Church. Unless there can be some such discussion and interchange of convictions and prejudices, it is obviously impossible that the various kinds of Christians in the world should ever come together.

The other method of arriving at unity is the one that is set forth by Pope Benedict, namely, the submission of all Christians in the world to his authority and their acknowledgment that he has by divine right supreme jurisdiction over the whole Church. Obviously this method would be slower in its working out, and not conspicuously in harmony with the spirit of the age. The prevailing tendencies of our time are toward sympathetic conference and co-operation. Unity of action usually proceeds from a better mutual understanding rather than from submission to an autocratic authority. We do not assert that the Roman pontiff can never succeed in bringing all Christians in the world to accept his supreme authority, simply because it would be contrary to the spirit of the age. We do assert that if he succeeds it will be nothing short of an ecclesiastical miracle.

The Futility of Individualism

THE resignation of the Bishop of Delaware will bring unhappiness and discouragement to many in the Church. He admits that his resignation, while partly due to ill health, is chiefly due to certain tendencies in the American Church with which he cannot sympathize. We hesitate to criticize the good bishop for his action until we know all the grounds of his decision. We can only say that it seems to us a vain and futile thing for one man, whether he be bishop, priest or layman, to act by himself in such matters and follow his own judgment without first taking counsel of others in the Church who have been of like mind with himself.

There are undoubtedly disquieting tendencies in our present ecclesiastical situation. If, however, any individual feels disquieted he may be perfectly certain that there are hundreds or thousands of others who feel as he does. Why should not all these people come together in some sort of conference, so that those whose conscience is troubling them may expound in detail the grounds of their unrest? Then let the whole matter be frankly and thoroughly debated until some course of action can be proposed which may receive the support of all those present. A scholarly bishop like Bishop Kinsman should be able to persuade such a gathering that the time has come when they must all leave the Church. In case he cannot persuade them it must be that his reasons are not cogent, and therefore he has no right to do what he cannot convince other men of like premisses that they should do also. The point is that this is no time for individualistic action. It is not a question of what one man wants to do or ought to do—it is a question of what half of the American Church ought to do. If one bishop ought to give up his office in the Church, then half the bishops and clergy in the Church ought to do likewise. It seems to us at this juncture there is a crying need that some such organization as the American Church Union should hold frequent conferences in various parts of the country attended by both clergy and laity for the purpose of discussing plans of action and deciding in what direction our duty lies in case certain measures are adopted by the coming General Convention. If the Church proves false to her trust, what is needed is not a few secessions but an earthquake. We appeal to the governing board of the American Church Union to rise to the emergency and take definite and courageous action.

Dr. Lyman Abbott on the Open Pulpit

THERE was a very interesting letter from the Rev. Dr. Lyman Abbott in the *Churchman* of May 17, on the Priestly and Prophetic Offices. He explains why he thinks there is nothing in the principles of the Anglo-Catholic to prevent him from inviting a non-episcopally ordained minister into his pulpit to preach to his congregation. He admits that the Anglo-Catholic cannot consistently invite such a minister to celebrate the Eucharist because that is a priestly function and the non-episcopally ordained minister is not a priest. Preaching, however, is not a priestly function and has never been so regarded by the Catholic Church. Later in his letter Dr. Abbott asserts that the Protestant minister is not a priest. He therefore comes to the conclusion that "If both anglo-catholic and protestant ministers would frankly recognize this age-long distinction between the priestly and the prophetic function, and anglo-catholic priests would invite protestant ministers into their pulpits, and protestant ministers would appreciate the fact that the anglo-catholic priest regards the Eucharist as a priestly function and therefore cannot consistently invite the protestant minister to officiate at the altar, a long step would be taken toward better relations between the two, and therefore toward Christian, if not church, unity."

Evidently Dr. Abbott thinks that it makes no difference what is preached from the pulpits of the Church. His contention is that as preaching is not a priestly function anybody can do it, and that there have been many cases in the Catholic Church of the laity preaching, especially among the preaching friars of the Middle Ages. He appears to us to hold that it makes no difference what kind of religion is

taught to the people from the pulpit. One preacher is convinced that our Lord is God incarnate and sets forth his conviction to the assembled faithful. The next Sunday another preacher who is convinced that our Lord was simply a man like the rest of us expounds his views from the same pulpit. What about the rights of the faithful to be protected from erroneous and strange doctrine?

Dr. Abbott is entirely mistaken if he thinks that Anglican Catholics object to the open pulpit because Protestant ministers are not priests. They object to it simply and solely because Protestant ministers for the most part do not believe in the kind of religion that the Church commissions her ministers to teach.

The editor of the *Churchman* is also laboring under a misunderstanding when he objects to the open pulpit being advocated on the one hand because it is a step towards unity and on the other hand decried because it is an obstacle to unity. This is not the real ground on which objection is taken to allowing ministers of all kinds to preach from our pulpits. We do not say that this objection has nothing to do with unity, but we do say that it is mainly because of the fundamental conviction that the Church is under obligations to teach the faith that she has received.

The Gift of Prophecy

THOSE who have done much preaching have had the experience many times of being caught up by their subject and possessed by it, both during the preparation and the delivery of the sermon. It seems as though some supernatural power had laid hold of them and implanted in their souls a fructifying idea of compelling power. Around that idea the sermon has grown in their mental processes with

an amazing rapidity; and to preach it has been a joy. Never for one moment could they doubt that they were being moved by the Spirit of God, or that the sermon when delivered would find lodgment in the souls of their hearers. We may call it the Divine Fire, or inspiration, or the spirit of prophecy, or whatever we like: it is a tremendous spiritual experience, and when it comes to the soul it is unmistakable.

Unfortunately this inner compulsion which so many preachers have felt more or less frequently in their ministry is not subject to command. "The wind bloweth where it listeth." It cannot be relied upon to come once a week. There may indeed be many weeks of barrenness and sterility, when the preacher feels that his task is impossible, and that for him to appear before his congregation Sunday after Sunday is an unspeakable effrontery.

What is a preacher to do when the tongue of fire fails to alight upon him, when he waits in vain to be endued with power from on high? It would seem that at such times his duty should be to preach a sermon of instruction, to set forth the faith of the Church upon some subject that is appropriate to that period of the Christian year. In this case he is simply the mouthpiece of the Church. He is not setting forth a vital thought that has just taken possession of his own soul, nor a burning message that God has apparently given him to speak at that particular moment; he is simply instructing the people committed to his pastoral care and building them up in sound Christian doctrine. He is not a prophet; he is simply a "scribe instructed unto the kingdom of heaven," who is like the "householder, which bringeth forth out of his treasure things new and old." It is not so exciting nor so romantic as to be a prophet; but it is doubtless quite as necessary and helpful for the spiritual welfare of the people committed to his charge.

Circles of Interest

EVERY human being stands at the center of many circles of varying diameter.

There is first the circle of his own individual interests, comprising such matters as health, business, family, and fortune. There are many people, perhaps the majority, who admit no wider interests than those which are concerned with their own individual welfare and happiness.

There is next the circle of Church parochial life, and there are fortunately many individuals who have been lifted out of themselves to the extent that they have become active workers in the various organizations of their parish church. It is undoubtedly a remarkable achievement to arouse anyone from the life of selfishness to take an interest in things spiritual and religious. To be sure, the interest that people exhibit in the life of their parish church is often a purely superficial interest. They are interested in the people who attend that church, or they like the rector, or the form of worship appeals to them, or they have become absorbed in some special organization in the parish. Perhaps it may be said that the greater number of people in any parish, who are interested to the extent that they come to church regularly and contribute to its support, are interested only in some of these things which lie on the surface, but are not really interested in religion.

It is not surprising therefore that it should be exceedingly difficult to persuade people on any large scale to be interested in wider ecclesiastical interests than those that are narrowly parochial. We could hardly expect under the normal conditions of Church life at the present day that any more than a few Christians would be keenly interested in the missionary work of the Church at home and abroad.

Probably the number of people in any parish, who are willing to contribute toward the support of our Church schools and colleges, could be numbered on the fingers of one hand. The same thing is true of Church papers. It takes a good deal of grace and it indicates unusual spiritual progress for anyone to take a Church paper. What does the average layman care for the news of the Church at large or the problems that are being discussed in Diocesan Conventions, in the Church Congress, or in General Convention? A few years ago an eminent layman, a deputy to the General Convention and a corporation lawyer of national fame, said almost in a spirit of boastfulness that he never read a Church paper. When one reads papers like the *Living Church*, or the *Churchman* as it has become under its recent able editorship, one is astonished that they should not have a circulation of twenty or thirty thousand. But when one scrutinizes the average parish and realizes how few people there are in any parish who acknowledge any wider circle of interest than their own parish activities, one is prepared to be disappointed.

Obviously something must be wrong. May it not be that the chief cause of this unhealthy condition in the Church is that we have so few converted people? We try to interest people in almost everything except religion. We try to arouse them to a white-heat of enthusiasm for an Every Member Canvass; or we try to enlist their efforts in welcoming soldiers and sailors; and now we are to begin a nation-wide campaign to raise many millions for the Church's missionary work. Hardly a month goes by but that someone invents a new kind of drive. The whole trouble is that it is all beginning at the wrong end. If the clergy could be allowed for a short space to devote themselves to the spiritual and religious work for which they

have been ordained, they might be able to convert more of our own people and get them more interested in God and His Kingdom. If we had more parishes which were exclusively concerned with spiritual matters and absorbed in the teaching and practice of the Christian religion, we should have more devoted and consecrated laymen; and they would be interested not only in their own narrow circles of activities but in the work of God everywhere in the world.

The Need of a Christian Philosophy

IN our Church schools and colleges, as well as in our theological seminaries, there is no distinctive Christian philosophy taught. Neither is there in any of the secular institutions of learning any philosophy which holds the field. There is no such thing today as a philosophy of the schools corresponding to the scholastic philosophy of the Middle Ages. There is undoubtedly a great need, especially in our theological seminaries, that our young men should be given a coherent philosophy of life.

We are therefore glad to give space in the current issue to a paper which was recently read in Philadelphia by Dr. Ralph Adams Cram, in which he appeals for the reinstatement of the scholastic philosophy. We are informed that the paper created considerable consternation among those that heard it. This is the kind of paper we like to print, even though we do not agree with all of its teaching. We need a few good healthy explosions in the Church today to wake people up and set them thinking.

Theology and Education*

BY THE RT. REV. PHILIP M. RHINELANDER, D.D.

I WOULD begin with a very simple parable. I would suggest for meditation an organist seated on his bench with the stops and keys before him, and the bellows working. Just what happens when he plays? Well, first the organist seems to disappear, brushed clean away and swallowed up by the spirit of music, awake and become vocal. The melodies, the interwoven harmonies, the swell and fall, the varying tones and qualities of sound, are there in their own right, by their own laws. No doubt the little man with his little hands and feet has raised the curtain, has played the part of call-boy, but all the rest is music. The organist has disappeared.

And yet, if he has disappeared, it is by his own act, or rather by his own art. Let him make a misstep upon his pedals or a slip by the smallest of his fingers, and he will come back upon you in his native and naked personality. There is no clearer instance of absolute and momentary control than that of an organ by an organist. It is a miracle of scientific and mechanical adjustment. Of ten thousand melodies, stored up in mind, or filed in manuscript, he has selected one. Of innumerable combinations of notes and tones he has chosen out his own. In the richest and loudest burst of music only a few pipes speak. The great majority are silent. A few pounds of pressure, rightly distributed through a space of fifteen minutes, applied by the half ounce, now here, now there, will evoke (or shall we say

* Paper read by the Bishop of Pennsylvania at the opening service in St. Peter's Church, New York, on the one hundredth anniversary of the General Theological Seminary, on May 1, 1919.

educe?) a hero's Dead March or an Angel's song. But the hero would not have been carried to his grave nor the Angel sung his song unless the organist had moved the stops and pressed the keys.

That is the parable. I freely admit its imperfections. And later I will come back to show just where it fails. But it will serve to point one truth, entirely self-evident and yet usually overlooked and not seldom voluminously and vehemently denied, namely, that education is in the very nature of the case dogmatic. The sounds and notes are doubtless latent in the child. He must produce them. But there is always an organist or educator who pulls or pushes as he wills.

A colossal and convincing illustration is found in the Kaiser and the German people. Take the Kaiser, if you like, not as by Divine right a veritable music-master, but as merely an automatic organ player. Figure the twenty army corps commanders and the battalions of subservient professors as the composers of the melody and the writers of the score. Granted that they steered his hands and feet to the proper keys and pedals, arranged the crescendos and diminuendos, and set all the combinations; still the thing is clear, past the shadow of a question, that one man played upon a people's soul and the 65,000,000 of them poured forth in answer their self-devoted and self-destructive chorus: "Deutschland, Deutschland über alles!"

The thing is so terrifically plain and evident, and it has taken place on such a portentous scale that a great mass of very modern pedagogy has been thrown into the scrap-heap over night and a great many modern pedagogues are seeking cover. For one cannot any longer talk about the free and uninfluenced shooting forth of the innate ideas of children and get away with it! For all time the world, even

the thoughtless world, will have before its eyes the great classical illustrations of all history, of what education really is and to what extraordinary perfection its process can be brought.

My first point then is that education is dogmatic, in the very nature of the case. And I use the word deliberately in view of what is to follow later on in this discussion. In any case it is as good as any other word and perhaps better.

For a dogma is nothing in the world but an idea sufficiently clear in the mind to be defined and sufficiently attractive to the heart to incite to propaganda. Dogma has no necessary religious connotation. A cook-book or a Liberty Loan circular is fairly teeming with it. Given an idea of any sort in actual process of transmission from mind to mind, and there is dogma at its work of education. There is no education otherwise.

So far we can press our parable quite fearlessly. The parents in the home, the nursery toys, the pictures on the walls, the posters on the boardings, are indeed educational, but they are educational simply because they are dogmatic. Some one has provided and prepared them: some one is pressing certain keys and pulling certain stops. In passing, let me point out another truth which springs immediately out of this and drives it home. Strictly speaking there are no *uneducated* people. Everyone really receives an equal amount of education. Those who can neither read nor write may be as much *educated*, though in a different way and along a different line, as those who are thoroughly at home in fifty languages and literatures.

What our common way of talking about this matter really means is that we have established certain standards; certain things which we have agreed to call right or wrong; cultured or barbarous. These are the *dogmas* which we

have determined to "put over" on the children, which are to evoke the harmonies or discords of the children's lives. It may be pacifist dogma which will have no soldiers in the nursery. It may be "liberal" dogma which, among other things, fervently believes that religious agnosticism is the proper and profitable spiritual state. In small groups or in large groups the inevitable process is kept working. No one escapes or can escape from it. Everybody is always educating and being educated. And in this as in other cases the first are often last, and the last first. Fagin the Jew in Dickens' story is as notable and efficient an educator as is President Butler of Columbia. Our streets are probably our most effective public schools.

So far the parable of organist and organ. But now it fails us. For the organ will have to be a magic organ if we are to use it to represent a child. It must have the power to multiply itself, to put forth new pipes and reeds of unimagined kind and quality. It must be able to keep on playing by itself and to make its own melodies and harmonies. It will not be altogether free. Always or nearly always it will be following out the impulse of the master who first drew sounds from it. Never, or scarcely ever, will it discover or recover the use of the notes and tones which he left silent. Always there will be some original capacity unused and useless. But still it must be miraculously self-determining and self-determined. For that is the reality of which the organist and organ are the type; that is the child, as he receives and completes his education.

And just here is where theology comes in. It is really very simple. Neither dreams, nor fears, nor ghosts have made men theologians, but just the mysteries of their own self-conscious life. Theology is nothing but philosophy trying to do justice, not to some fragments, but to the whole

of our experience. It is simply our true and brave insistence that there are answers to our deepest questions; that there is a key to the understanding even of the human heart. Faith in God is not strictly speaking the same thing as faith in man. But one can't possibly have the last without the first. For God alone makes valid man's experience. Without God, men do not know at all who they are, or where they are, or what that should be at. That is why men seek after God, that they may believe in Him and in themselves.

Now quite clearly what happens to and in the child when he takes himself into his own hands, and voluntarily acts and reacts for or against the impulses which have been given him, will depend upon his philosophy of life. Again I deliberately use a long word because I want to rob it of its terrors and show it as a perfectly simple and every-day affair. A philosopher is simply one who views his own life as a whole. Everyone does that. Everybody has to do it. So everyone is a philosopher. We are not all the time in philosophic mood. A pregnant moment, an absorbing task, a keen emotion while it lasts, robs us of our philosophy. We live much of the time from hand to mouth; on trains and trolleys, in books and theatres. Life is one thing after another. And yet it is all bound together with a dominating purpose, by a single will, towards a *summum bonum*. "No man can serve two masters." There may be breaks away from the main track. There may be pauses in back waters, sometimes even a stroke or two pulled against the current (as in "Dear Brutus"). But each is ruled by his philosophy; by his whole view of his whole life.

And if God is not at work in our philosophy, then the God-like part of our nature will have no stimulus, will not

be roused, will count for nothing. It will be a stop which has been pulled out; a note that never has been sounded. I believe it is true that the hunting instinct of some breeds of dogs will die out of them if for a certain space after their birth they are kept from any use of it. And those who have patiently amassed the facts tell us the same story about children's capacity for faith in God. If the religious instinct is left dormant up to the 13th or 14th year it is almost always permanently lost. How singularly blind, how scientifically fatuous, how intellectually self-deceived are they who make pretense of leaving it to children (their own or other people's) to decide whether they will believe in God or no! Truly a child may give up his theology even after he has been taught it, just as he may give up music after he has made painful acquaintance with the scales, or Greek after he has read a book of Xenophon, or Hebrew after he has gone through six chapters out of Genesis. But, just as he could never have learned to use even the English language unless some one had taught it to him, so he can never come to believe in God unless some one *dogmatically* tells him to.

Now we have the word in its right contact. Now we are at grips with the real question, with the real difficulty. But even so, I doubt if we all see quite clearly where the difficulty lies. All education is and must be dogmatic. Medicine, law, football, dress and dancing; in every possible department some one must do the pushing and the pulling if there is to be any education. In other fields and subjects there is no sort of doubt or hesitation. But in religion; in the life with God; in the laws which control our commerce with the spiritual world; dogmas are "tabu"! And we talk very seriously and very earnestly about the great ideal of educating people in religion without teaching them the-

ology. And what we say is utter nonsense. We see the nonsense of it if we stop to think. But do we see the reason for the nonsense? Do we realize why we are willing to stultify ourselves and to use words wholly without meaning?

In the last analysis I believe Mr. Chesterton is right in saying that what inhibits us is *fear*. "Most modern freedom," he writes, "is at root fear. It is not so much that we are too bold to endure rules; it is rather that we are too timid to endure responsibility, (especially) the responsibility of affirming the truth of our human tradition and handing it on with an unshaken voice. That is the one eternal education: to be sure enough that something is true that you dare to tell it to a child. From this high audacious duty the moderns are fleeing on every side and the only excuse for them is that their modern philosophies are so half-baked and hypothetical that they cannot convince themselves enough to convince even a new-born babe."*

So far Mr. Chesterton. I think he puts his finger on the spot. I think what inhibits us is fear; the rest is "camouflage"; scenic display, elaborate designs, intricate word-painting to cover up the ugly fact of moral weakness, of hesitating will. Grounding on this, Chesterton goes on. "The educationist must find a creed and teach it. Out of all the throng of theories he must somehow select a theory. Out of all the thundering voices he must manage to hear a voice. Out of all the awful and aching battle of blinding lights, without one shadow to give shape to them, he must manage to trace and to track a star."† That is sonorous writing, but it is very near to simple common sense.

* G. K. Chesterton "What's Wrong with the World" (New York, 1910), p. 254.

† Ibid. p. 276.

For us who believe in, and would foster, Christian education; who with open eyes and ready wills understand that this can be accomplished only by dogmatically teaching Christianity; there is one way and no other for us to walk in; one thing and no other for us to do. We must find a Christian creed and teach it. And there is only one creed for us to find, one which we have already found; or rather, by God's mercy, has found us; namely, the Creed of the Catholic Church. It and it alone enshrines the truth of our human tradition; it and it alone conserves the whole spiritual capital of our race; the sum of secure apprehension of spiritual things which under God the family of men have gained. It is the very charter of the soul's liberty in the presence of and by the power of its God.

It is becoming increasingly clear, — in the light of the most sure results of scholarship, and especially in these great latter days of soul-searching spiritual strain, — that the question we were so fond of asking in the days before the war, "What is Christianity?" is one of the easiest and straightest questions in the world to answer, provided we really want to get the answer and are not seeking to start a new "home-made" religion under the patronage of our Blessed Lord. The Apostolic Creed buttressed by the Apostolic record; the Apostolic Sacraments secured by the Apostolic Ministry; it is one coherent whole; tested, beaten out, compact together, native everywhere, sufficient always; regenerating sinners, sanctifying saints, setting free the intellect, giving to all human arts a new and thrilling soul and purpose; moulding the social order; guarding the home; reconciling classes; knitting the nations; dignifying, vitalizing, fructifying human life on every level, in every corner, under every circumstance. It is our great democratic spiritual heritage. It is God in His Son and through

His Spirit making His whole creation vocal in His praise.

There lies our work. But if we are to do it we must be resolute. We must give up our compromising. We must shirk no sacrifice nor labor. We must close up our ranks. We must have a common mind. I do not overlook the difficulties. After much drifting it is not always easy to find the proper anchorage, nor even to recognize it after it is found. After centuries of divided counsels and rank crops of private fantasies and fancies, it will take no little patience, wisdom and courage, to draw the line quite clearly between preference and principle, to be "first pure and then peaceable." Indeed the really effective prosecution of our task must wait on the reunion of the Churches. Community of mind is after all not the condition precedent, but the sure and blessed consequent of community in prayer, and above all, in worship.

Yet there is much more to do than watchful waiting. We can at least get to the heart of our problem, even if our reach falls far short of the extremities. Fr. Waggett, I think, it is who reminds us that the true analogue of the Church Catholic is not a field fenced in, so that everybody is definitely on the inside or the outside: but rather a blazing sun lighting a universe. Looking ahead along its rays it may puzzle you to know where light ends and dark begins; but there is no doubt whatever about the sun, where it is and what it is.

And this is my last word. I have played rather loosely with my assigned subject. I have read the banns, rather than solemnized the marriage, between Education and Theology. But I know how and by whom their union is indissolubly made and fertilized unto eternal life, namely, by the Holy Spirit. Our theology must be all built up, veri-

fied, unified and vitalized in and by Him; our education must be based on faith in His regenerating, illuminating, and reproductive power.

It is simply true that one does not arrive at Christianity until one has received the Holy Ghost; that the only really logical and defensible definition of a Christian is just this—one who has received Him. The whole business of really Catholic theology is to set this forth, to press it home, to give the ways and means by which this supernatural Presence and Companionship may be established and maintained; to make His call to fellowship seem as persuasive, as sweetly reasonable, as it is. And similarly the whole business of Catholic education is to keep the child within the circle of His stimulating influence; to see that all doors are open for His entrance; that every latent faculty of godly faith and fear and of human helpfulness may be touched into life, unrolled, developed, brought to full fruition by the light which is the life of men.

At the hundredth anniversary of this School of Theologians, in the midst of men of mature and well-furnished minds, I have been talking almost wholly about children. Indeed I have had my heart and mind deliberately set on the mystery and magic of an infant class. And my plea in self-defense is, not simply that we have all been children, nor even that we all have, or shall have, children, few or many, under our spiritual guidance. But rather that the laboratory both of education and theology is in the spirit of a very little child; that if we now or later, in this world or the next, are to be theologically sound and thoroughly well educated, we, before it is too late, must become as little children.

The Danger in the Proposed Canon

BY A PRESBYTER OF THE CHURCH.

SOMEWHAT less than a year ago hospitality was accorded in this monthly to a contribution entitled *The Church: The Report of a Misgiving*, in which the present writer, as one of the crowd of men entrusted with the *sacerdotium*, ventured to state his apprehensions with regard to the result of certain movements and tendencies within our communion and to ask for some reassurances from those in a position to allay his fears. Such reassurances have not been vouchsafed; whether from indifference, as he may infer, or from the fact that his misgiving is too strongly shared by those who think along similar lines, as he suspects. Indeed, fresh instances have arisen that seem strongly to justify his diagnosis of the situation a year ago. He ventures again to write on the subject under the cover of anonymity, not because he shrinks from avowing his opinions over his own name, but because he feels that by withholding his name his opinions, not being associated with what is known or imagined concerning his personality, will more likely be and seem representative of the fairly large number of churchmen for whom he is confident that he substantially speaks.

The time for courteously requesting reassurances from those who contravene the Church's law and compromise her Catholic claims has passed. It is evident that they will not be forthcoming. It is clear that we must now contend for the faith delivered unto us, lest shortly we find ourselves in a communion that has officially repudiated principles inherent in her constitution if she be a portion of the Catholic Church.

The immediate instance that has sharpened apprehension and revived fears is the memorial urging what is already widely known as "The Proposed Canon," which is being discussed in Diocesan Synods and threatens to loom up as the dominant question at the General Convention in October.

The Proposed Canon giving our bishops the permission to ordain Congregational ministers under certain (as it seems, very easy) circumstances is the more perplexing because it has been embodied in a memorial signed by a group of prominent churchmen which includes not only those from whose publicly expressed opinions it might readily be inferred such legislation would be congenial, but by others who a year or so since it might have been thought would be the last to associate themselves with such a radical and dangerous experiment. Indeed, with regard to one signer of the memorial, who in the past few years has been widely acclaimed and generally trusted as a leader by those whose loyalty to the Anglican Communion is measured by their conviction that she is a portion of the Catholic Church, a familiar quotation aptly suggests itself—"This was the most unkindest cut of all." There is, perhaps, a single comfort in the fact that this memorial, having been signed by Catholic churchmen, the Proposed Canon will therefore not be a party question in Convention nor apt to be accepted or rejected on strictly party lines. And yet for the sake of so dubious an advantage, Catholic champions will be unwillingly spared to serve as defenders for this new scheme for Protestant unity.

A few observations on the Proposed Canon are pertinent before the suggestion of an important step that should immediately be taken by those who most conscientiously oppose it.

1. What possible advantage, it may be asked, can be derived from a partial union with Congregationalists that will be achieved at the almost certain expense of violent discord among ourselves? It would seem that we Episcopalians already sufficiently differ in our interpretation of the faith and in our practice of religion without representatives of our several parties uniting to propose a fresh cause of controversy.

2. The Proposed Canon is avowedly a step toward re-union, and we are bidden to acquiesce in its adoption from purely sentimental reasons, on the ground, it is plainly said, that God has blessed the Congregational ministry. All Christians will gladly concede this fact, and yet while admiration may be professed the cogency of the argument may be denied. God's blessing on other ways of life dispenses us no whit from the obligation to follow the way made plain to us. Frankest and fullest appreciation of the grace and virtue that shine in Congregational ministers, the most passionate desire to coöperate in all good works, cannot justify the compromise of a single principle to which as communicants in the Catholic Church we are committed. We did not devise the constitution of the Church, and our General Convention is powerless to change it.

We are told that to oppose the adoption of this legislation is to thwart the answering of our Lord's high-priestly prayer. It were well that we should recall the terms in which that prayer was offered. Our Saviour prayed that his followers might be one, even as he and the Father were one. It is certain that God the Father and God the Son were one, not only in spirit and in will, but in *mind* as well. The unity of Christendom must be, therefore, not only a unity of spirit, of good will and of right feeling, but a unity of *mind*—or, as St. Paul most aptly put it, a unity in the

faith. Few of those who advocate the conferring of the priesthood upon such Congregational ministers as may desire it, could argue that we are of one mind with Congregationalists. Indeed, it is impossible to ascertain the mind of the Congregational body, for essentially and by its very theory it is of many minds. The plea that after all Episcopalians are in the same case is not germane, for whatever differences of opinion exist amongst us, we are still, fortunately, pledged to the same definite formularies. And until those formularies are impugned or compromised or repudiated by official action, we must take our stand upon them and challenge the world to upset us.

Do the signers and defenders of the Proposed Canon suppose there is a kind of magic in the grace of orders that will with the laying on of the bishop's hands transform a convinced Congregationalist into a churchman,—particularly when it is recalled that he will receive the priesthood without being asked to accept any theory of the ministry, not even that of the Church whose bishops will ordain him?

Unity, when it comes in God's good time and God's good way, will be a unity in the faith. A unity which is indifferent to the "theories" always held in the Catholic Church can scarcely be worth the sacrifices that must be made in order to attain it.

3. Another grave objection to the proposed legislation is that recently expounded by the Bishop of Vermont in a number of this journal. The Canon makes no adequate provision for the relation of the ordained Congregational minister to the bishop who ordains him. His status would remain that of a practically independent priest. And further, the Canon makes no provision at all for the relation to the Bishop of the unconfirmed Congregational people to whom the ordained clergyman will subsequently minister

the sacraments. It would extend the highest privileges of the Church to Congregationalists on terms far easier and more vague than those which our own people are required to accept. In short, the Canon proposes to substitute the symbol of unity—communion—for the thing itself.

4. Furthermore, can we expect that this proposed ordination of certain Congregational ministers will tend to unite Congregationalists themselves? As it is sure to prove with us the matter for long controversy, with its almost inevitable bitterness and passion, is it not likely also, to sow seeds of dissension in the ministry to whom we offer the gift? It is impossible not to believe that the great majority of Congregational ministers are what they are because they are convinced that they already possess the right and true form of Christian order. It is to be supposed that Principal Selbie speaks with authority for many Free Church ministers in England. It has been enlightening to read his able comments on such movements, as were fully reported in the *English Church Times* for April 4. Surely no one can advocate such ordination of Congregational ministers in the mere hope that now and then we might altogether win certain of them to the ministry of the Church. Since we concede so gladly the work of the Holy Spirit amongst them, need we imagine that the Holy Spirit would work more freely after certain of them had submitted to the laying on of Apostolic hands? The proposition involves far more than the mere regularization of non-episcopal orders.

The proposal could have promise only if it came from the Congregational Church as a united body to which we unitedly responded, or as an offer on our part that they officially accepted. It is far from that; indeed, it might be predicted that a General Conference of Congregational ministers

might indignantly repel the denial of their orders as such reordination must necessarily imply.

5. It may be fairly pleaded that the adoption of the Proposed Canon will complicate the situation which we trust will before long be discussed by the World Conference on Faith and Order; and it is certainly true that it would prejudice to the point of hopelessness the prospect or possibility of reunion with other portions of the Catholic Church.

Such are among the reasons that lead us to deplore this proposal, and that should spur us to defeat it in General Convention. The trouble with us has been that we have been too proud to fight, too confident that we might hold the faith in security and peace without contending for it.

It has frequently been charged that the Catholic party in the Church has secured its progress and won its victories by adroit diplomacy, secret combination and open systematic coöperation. Nothing is further from the truth. If the writer for the moment may speak for himself, he must plead that throughout his ministry he has been associated almost exclusively with clergymen who did not share his views. He has never belonged to a single association or society, save for one brief unsatisfactory year, organized for the defense of any Church principle or practice. His own ministrations have been almost invariably of the conventional Protestant Episcopal type. He has never been nor wanted to be a party man. Indeed, on more than one occasion, he has spoken and written to the purport that our party differences are exaggerated and misleading to ourselves as to outsiders. In a dilemma such as this he knows of few to whom he may turn for sympathetic counsel. He knows positively of no organization to which he may now appeal to use its influence in support of the views

and principles that he has indicated above. Indeed, of all parties in the Church the so-called Catholic or High Church party seems the most completely disorganized and the most widely scattered, the one least equipped for coöperation. Such he is sure is the experience and the feeling of most churchmen of his general type. This is due, as has been already said, to a strong dislike to contention about what we feel the formularies of the Church guarantee to us; it is due also to natural dislike to putting ourselves in opposition to our best friends, and frequently to our bishops. There is also another reason for this disunion in regard to ecclesiastical politics—with regard to many details of the Catholic movement we naturally (and rightly, I think) differ amongst ourselves. Unfortunately for our cause the conservative High Churchman is as suspicious of the Romanizing tendencies of his “advanced” fellow priest as the “ritualist” is contemptuous of the content of many of us with old-fashioned ways and a plain ceremonial.

It is high time that we put our minor differences aside and unite to contend for the great positive principles that are of the essence of the faith. It is time that we unite to combat such proposals as the one under discussion which seem to us almost certain to disrupt the Church, proposals which, if adopted, are admirably calculated to facilitate for many the crossing of the Tiber; and will leave others of us, for whom that solution of our difficulties is impossible, stranded high and dry upon an ecclesiastical desert-island, a despairing non-juring remnant.

There is in existence, I understand, an organization called The American Church Union, of which since I long ago declined to be a member I have rarely heard and seldom thought. Its purpose, one recalls, was to organize Catholic churchmen in such fashion as they could more effectively

combat attacks on Catholic faith and practice from without and within our communion; a body, therefore, for which the present emergency might be the occasion of great usefulness.

The particular point of this paper is to enquire if the American Church Union still exists; and if in existence if it may not be galvanized into more vigorous activity? Such an organization might well undertake the task of gauging the strength of the opposition to this proposed legislation, organize such forces of opposition as may emerge upon appeal, and lead them to exert their strength in General Convention to defeat this proposal, through bishops and deputies who are in sympathy with the purpose and by means of memorials circulated in every diocese and parish in the country.

It is unlikely that General Convention, even if it could muster a vote and secure the passage of the Proposed Canon, would do so in the face of strong united opposition on the part of any considerable number of clergy and laity. The defenders of the Proposed Canon will prove as generous, it is supposed, as were the advocates of the change of name some years ago, who might have pressed to a successful vote their resolution to get rid of the unfortunate name by which "this Church" is known in law.

The Proposed Canon is not the only cause for apprehension or the only ground of misgiving, but it is at the moment the most serious and the danger of its adoption the most threatening.

The time is short. The advocates of the proposal are powerful and persuasive, and they have the advantage of the strong appeal that it makes to our charitable sentiments. The Church must not be allowed to drift into the adoption of such radical and revolutionary polity. The

question must be thoroughly discussed, and vigorously and unitedly combated by those who conscientiously oppose it. If this Church ultimately adopts it, we shall at least know definitely, though we be lost ourselves, whither this Church has gone.

The Philosophical Necessity

BY RALPH ADAMS CRAM, LITT.D., LL.D.

"THEY are called wise who put things in their right order and control them well." So begins the first sentence of the "Summa Contra Gentiles" of St. Thomas Aquinas. The implied condemnation of those who establish false standards of comparative value and ill control those erroneously fixed, holds today as it held in the year 1262, even though now they may be a preponderant multitude when then they were a minor if conspicuous faction.

"To put things in their right order and control them well"; is not this the essence of wisdom and the secret of righteous life? To weigh and assort all things, estimating the value of each in relation to all others and to eternal truth; to exalt and pursue the things that are great and admirable and everlasting; to cast down and reject those things that are insignificant and transitory and without value. This is the substance of wisdom, as it is the object of each man's living; that he may control them well, both the great things and the small, not by fumbling hands and unstable minds swayed by every wind of doctrine aroused by Roger Bacon's "vulgi sensus imperiti," but with the firm grasp of mastership directed by an intrepid and reasonable mind.

This is that Wisdom that is the eternal goal of intellectual man, and "Philosophia" the way of that everlasting pilgrimage. "Philosophy," says the great Cardinal of Malines, "is the science of the totality of things. The particular sciences are directed to groups of objects more or less restricted; philosophy, the general science, regards the sum-total of reality." So it appears that philosophy alone enables us to "put things in their right order" when the accidents and illusions of life, and the narrow outlook of the single sciences, have confused all relations; and without a right philosophy we are as those of whom Hugh of St. Victor speaks who "stumbled and fell into the falsehoods of their own imaginings."

But the boon of a right philosophy is not the wages of a delving intellectuality nor is it the laurel crown of profound erudition. They that are thus furnished may attain the highest good, as Aristotle and St. Thomas Aquinas, but achievement is granted also to the humble and the unlearned, the shepherd on the hills, the poet in bitter exile, the monk in his forgotten cloister. There is much truth in the words of Friar Bacon, "all the wisdom of philosophy is created by God and given to the philosophers, and it is Himself that illuminates the minds of men in all wisdom." This is necessarily so; from Aristotle to the modern Aquinas, Henri Bergson, every philosopher who can justly claim that title has based his system on the primary assumption that man, of his own motion, cannot remotely touch the "thing-in-itself," the noumenon, the Absolute, but is able to deal only with the phenomenon, or, as Aristotle calls it, the "phantasm." "In the present state of life in which the soul is united to a passable body," says St. Thomas, "it is impossible for our intellect to understand anything actually, except by turning to the phantasm," and Bergson

says the same when he states as an axiom that "the mind of man by its very nature is incapable of apprehending reality." Philo, the Platonist Jew, put it succinctly when he wrote "The trammels of the body prevent men from knowing God in Himself; He is known only in the Divine forces in which He manifests Himself."

Yet if we would live we must be able "to put things in their right order," and to know God in the sense of personal approach if not of comprehension. It is here that the love of God shows itself in that He does again and again reveal enough of the everlasting wisdom and of Himself, to enable men to assure themselves that He is, and if they will, to turn their footsteps in the right way.

Through the Incarnation came not only the Redemption but also the Enlightenment, and thereafter the order of the Universe and the significance of life were as clear as they may ever be without a further explicit Revelation; but "God has never left Himself without a witness" and so five centuries before the Incarnation, and since then amongst those who knew not Christ, much has been revealed, so that great philosophers have appeared and have spoken "with the tongues of men and angels," and the things that we may use for our soul's health today, when in our own time, with all our erudition and our scientific attainment and our stored up knowledge of centuries, the Divine revelation has not come, and we have not only forgotten or rejected the philosophy of the inspired men of the past, but as well have taken to ourselves those that spoke without God, makers of false philosophies, and so have "fallen into the falsehoods of our own imaginings."

In this fact lies not only the reason why the world in spite of its material glory dipped lower and lower towards the point of disaster achieved in July, A. D. 1914, but the

explanation of the notorious inability of both organized religion and formal philosophy to meet the challenge of a world in dissolution during four years of war, and finally the lack of a great, constructive, dynamic leading on, at this moment when the destinies of man are being determined for a period of five centuries. There is today no operative philosophy of life; we are trifling with the shreds and shards of the materialistic and mechanical substitutes of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, from Descartes to Herbert Spencer, from Hobbes and Kant to Nietzsche and William James, and in them there is neither health nor safety, nor the clear conviction, the lucid and logical organism, the invigorating and passionate force of the Athenians, the Fathers of the Church, the Neo-Platonists or the mighty masters of Mediævalism.

The Reformation destroyed more for us of the North and the West than the fabric of the Catholic Church and the substance of the Catholic Faith. The nexus between theology and philosophy is so close that what affects one affects the other. "Intellege ut credas; crede ut intellegas," says St. Augustine. It is not so much that theology begins where philosophy leaves off, and *vice versa*, as it is that both pursue an actually parallel course in time, and side by side; if one falls the other stumbles, and unless quick recovery is effected both are involved in a common ruin. I do not know which stumbled first at that critical moment when Mediævalism yielded to the Renaissance. Macchiavelli wrote "Il Principe" in 1513, Luther posted his Thesis in 1517, and the protagonist of the assault on Catholic philosophy and ethics would thus appear to have an advantage of some four years over the protagonist of the assault on the Catholic theology and religion. On the other hand, while the new paganism in philosophy does not antedate

the fall of Constantinople in 1453, the particular form of heresy that was to rend the unity of the Church for the latest time and plunge entire nations in centuries of heresy and schism, had shown itself sporadically more than a hundred years before. The question is of no importance; the first breakdown of Catholic theology and Catholic philosophy practically synchronized during the period known as the Reformation, and wherever the Faith was abandoned the philosophy went with it.

Our own epoch, modernism, (as one should say Mediævalism, or the Dark Ages or Roman Imperialism), the five hundred years extending from the formal end of the Middle Ages in 1453 to 1953—or whatever may be the year when the next epoch is determined for good or ill, is that period during which the peoples that rejected both Catholic theology and Catholic philosophy, or tolerated both with a thin formalism that coided them of all power, have directed the development of society and determined the lives of its peoples up to and including its climacteric in the Great War. Whether they were worth having at the price, this new religion and this new philosophy—or rather *these*, for the diversity is extreme—does not concern me at this present. The point I wish to make is that as those two things, each unique in its sphere, made possible the five centuries of Mediæval civilization which formed the most successful exposition of Christianity that has thus far been achieved, and that as their obliteration is responsible for the civilization (however we may estimate it) that has now succeeded in destroying itself after a remarkable domination of other five centuries, so the future, the foundations of which we have not to lay, can only approach in dignity, nobility and achievement the Christian centuries of the Middle Ages if we are willing

and able to forsake modernist religion and modernist philosophy and return explicitly to the religion and the philosophy of that incomparable olden time. In a word, a sane and wholesome and just and righteous future can be built only on the corner-stones of Catholic religion and Sacramental philosophy.

For once it is not necessary to argue over the matter of religion; the logic of events has dealt with that and fixed its own determinations. The question of philosophy is in a different category. We have so long been accustomed to live without a philosophy and to take refuge in archaeology and "the general appeal to history" and the flimsy scaffoldings of Teutonism or Evolutionism or Pragmatism, we neither feel the need of this strong defense, this vast directing energy, nor take kindly to it when it is offered. Yet there can be no right and enduring religion without a right philosophy, as there can be no right and enduring philosophy without a right religion. "Philosophy is the science of the totality of things." They are called wise (that is to say, philosophers) who put things in their right order and control them well." "Philosophy regards the sum-total of reality." The moment has come for us to see things as a whole, to establish a new system of comparative values, to confront not fictions but realities. "The integrity of our nature is repaired by wisdom," wrote St. Vincent of Beauvais. Reparation lies before us; of our nature, of society and of the world, and to that end we must turn to philosophy, that as ever it may fortify the impulse of religion and by religion be irradiated by the grace of God.

What then is this philosophy of the Middle Ages that is in itself as definite as the Catholic Faith? It is no ethnic or passing intellectual by-product; it is the synthesis of

antecedent philosophies, Neo-Platonic, Jewish, Arabian, Byzantine, Patristic, Peripatetic, Socratic, purged of their alien elements, gathered into an organic unity, and vitalized by the Catholic religion. Its greatest exponents are St. Thomas Aquinas, Duns Scotus and Hugh of St. Victor. It was this philosophy that, consciously or unconsciously, formed the substance of the wisdom of the peoples of the Middle Ages, conditioning all their acts and all their intellectual processes. As, with the Catholic religion, it was the energizing force in life, making possible the only consistent Christian civilization thus far achieved, so was it the full rounding out of a great culture that re-created all the arts for its own expression, invented new ones, and raised them all to a level of unexampled achievement. Its abandonment synchronized, if it did not compass, the fall of Christian civilization and the entrance of the New Paganism which has now, in its turn, met its nemesis in its own suicidal aggrandizement.

In trying to express in brief and suggestive form this philosophy of sacramentalism. I have not confined myself to any one system; neither to the Dominican, the Franciscan nor the Augustinian synthesis; I have tried to establish a working theory by a moulding together of all these (since for all practical purposes this is what historically happened) and I have not disdained a return on occasion, to the Neo-Platonists, particularly Plotinus, and to the Greek and Jewish philosophers themselves, from whom all their successors have learned much and at whose feet they have sat as respectful scholars. Daring much in this process, I have doubtless fallen into philosophical error and perhaps have even offended against dogmatic truth, but I profess here and now that I submit all I say

to Catholic Authority, and that I desire to teach nothing contrary to the Catholic Faith.

The world as we know it, man, life itself as it works through all creation, is the union of matter and spirit; and matter is not spirit, nor spirit matter, nor is one a mode of the other, but they are two different creatures. Apart from this union of matter and spirit there is no life in the sense in which we know it, and severance is death. "The body," says St. Thomas, "is not of the essence of the soul; but the soul by nature of its essence can be united to the body, so that properly speaking, the soul alone is not the species, but the composite," and Duns Scotus makes clear the nature and origin of this common "essence" when he says there is "on the one hand God as Infinite Actuality, on the other spiritual and corporeal substances possessing a homogeneous common element." That is to say, both matter and spirit are the result of the Divine creative act and though separate and opposed find their common point of departure in the Divine Actuality.

The created world is the concrete manifestation of matter through which, for its own transformation and redemption, spirit is active in a constant process of interpenetration, whereby matter itself is being eternally redeemed. What then is matter, and what is spirit? In the theory of Plotinus, "the process of emanation from a Supreme Principle, the one source of all existing things, explains the physical and metaphysical worlds. According as the principle gives out its energy, it exhausts itself, its determinations follow a descending scale, becoming less and less perfect. Every generative process implies a decadence or inferiority in the generated product. And in the series of Divine generations there must be a final stage, at which the primal energy, weakened by successive emissions, is

no longer capable of producing anything real. A limit is necessarily reached beneath which there cannot be anything less perfect; this limit is *matter*. *Matter* is merely the space which conditions all corporate existence; it is a pure possibility of being, mere nothingness, and is identified with primitive evil.

In the sense he clearly intends, Plotinus' theory of "emanation" is of course superseded by the Christian doctrine of creation, but it was an illuminating approximation to final truth. Similarly, God cannot exhaust Himself, but there is manifestly a great discrepancy in point of perfection between the angels at one end of the scale, and simple matter, before form is given it, at the other, while in between are the many categories of creation. Neither is matter "mere nothingness" for it is a created thing, therefore it exists, even without form. I do not quote Plotinus as authoritative, but rather as one who through "natural" revelation has approached closely to the truth of Divine revelation.

Subjected to certain necessary changes in terminology I cannot see why this definition of matter does not coincide with Duns Scotus' *Materia primo prima*, which is thus described by the great Franciscan. *Materia primo prima* is the indeterminate element of contingent things. This does not exist in Nature, but it has reality in so far as it constitutes the term of God's creative activity. By its union with a substantial form it becomes endowed with the attributes of quantity and becomes *secundo prima*. Subject to the substantial changes of Nature it is matter as we perceive it."*

* Plotinus calls matter "the limit" of Divine generation because it marks the *exhaustion* of creative activity. Scotus calls it "the term" because beyond it God did not *will* to extend this creative activity.

It is this "*materia primo prima*," "the term of God's creative activity," that is eternally subjected to the regenerative process of spiritual interpenetration, and the result is organic life.

Is this matter "primitive evil" in the sense in which Plotinus uses it? No, for "*omne ens est bonum*" and because "God made all things good from the beginning." On the other hand matter is in itself dead, inert, constantly exerting a gravitational pull on spirit that must be overcome. In a real sense therefore its inertness does manifest itself as "evil" since its resistance to spirit is actual and must be overcome.

What is "spirit" as the term is used here? The creative Power of the Logos, in the sense in which St. John interprets and corrects the early partial and erroneous theory of the Stoics and of Philo. God the Son, the Eternal Word of the Father, "the brightness of His Glory and the figure of His substance." "God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God, begotten not made, being of one substance with the Father, by whom all things were made." Pure wisdom, pure intellect, pure will, unconditioned by matter, but creating life out of the operation of His spirit on and through matter, and in the fullness of time becoming Incarnate for the purpose of the final redemption of Man.

Now since man is so compact of matter and of spirit, it must follow that he cannot lay hold of that pure spirit, that Absolute that lies beyond and above all material conditioning, except through the medium of matter, through its figures, its symbolism, its "Phantasms" as Plato denotes them. Says St. Thomas, "From material things we can rise to some kind of knowledge of immaterial things, but not to the perfect knowledge thereof." The way of life therefore is the increasing endeavor of man to ap-

proach the Absolute through the leading of the Spirit, so running parallel to that slow perfecting of matter which is being effected by the same operation. So matter takes on a certain sanctity not only as something in process of perfection, but as the vehicle of Spirit and its tabernacle, since in matter Spirit is for us in a sense incarnate.

From this process follows of necessity the whole sacramental system of the Catholic Church, as this is set over against both the Protestant theory and that of modernist symbolism. To the Protestant as to the Jew the material thing is (though only in theory) incorrigibly base, to be despised and treated with contempt, while the spiritual thing, the soul, may and does unite itself to, and perfectly achieve, union with ultimate spirit directly, without the intervention of the material vehicle, and in proportion to its isolation from matter. The Protestant rejects even the value of the symbol, the modern symbolist, or ritualist if you like the word better, sees the symbol and values it, but he does not recognize the reality behind the symbol, contenting himself with what is no more than a form of poetry or other art, and he no more achieves either a right philosophy, the real religion, or that mystical union with God that is his aim, than does the Protestant or the scientific rationalist. I speak of generalities; there are anomalous personalities that, for His own ends, God gives that Beatific Vision that "o'erleaps the bounds" of matter, whereby the law of life is for them superseded and the material nexus is abrogated. These are the prophets, seers, mystics—the greatest artists perhaps as well—but they are not properly of this world as we know it; for the vast majority of men the way of matter is the road proscribed.

How fatal is this pseudo-philosophy that would cleave life in halves by isolating matter on one side and Spirit

on the other, is shown by the experience of those who accepted it. Rejecting the Sacraments as Divine channels of grace ordered and established for the transfusion through material agencies of the power of God the Holy Ghost, and denying even the value of their symbolism; denouncing the priesthood as a man-made obstacle between the created and the Creator, scorning the body and condemning all material things as hateful and as stumbling blocks, they nevertheless became the proponents of aggressive materialism; organizers of industrialism, creators of "big business" and "high finance," exploiters of labour and of markets, prophets of a civilization of greed, covetousness and profiteering. It is the Protestant nations and their *enclaves* of Jews that built up that materialistic civilization that in its bloated triumph found its own nemesis in the war of the last five years and the events that are to follow in the five next years that are to come. The material thing is deadly only when it is cut off from the spiritual thing; united, matter ennobled as an agent, Spirit familiarized through its homely housing, we have that just balance which has issue in a culture and a civilization such as that of the Middle Ages.

Sacramentalism, in theology, in discipline and in philosophy, is the essential system of Christianity, and it follows inevitably from the fundamental doctrines of the Incarnation and the Redemption. Those portions of the Church of Christ that adhere to it in its three manifestations will endure, the others will wither away. Furthermore, no compromise is possible any more than compromise is possible with truth. As the time came when America could no longer exist half slave and half free, so the time has now come (and the warning has been explicit) when the Church can no longer exist under the same conditions.

As the rejection of the Seven sacraments deprived northern Europe of that stream of spiritual energy, forever, and by the covenant of God, coursing through the several material channels of operation, leaving man bereft of his surest reinforcement against the eternal gravitational pull of matter; as the abandonment of Catholic order and discipline unloosed the floods of intellectual insolence and vulgarian presumptuousness, cleaving Christianity in halves and reducing the moiety thereof into a howling chaos of ill-conditioned heresies, so the forsaking of Sacramental philosophy left life meaningless except as a sort of neo-Manicheism as exploited by Calvin and the Puritans, and as an everlasting warfare, the prize of which was material gain through power or money, as was demonstrated (though not always avowed) by the creators and beneficiaries of industrial civilization. The nineteenth century philosophy of Evolution with its dogmas of the struggle for life, and the survival of the fittest, was the effort of sincere men to cast a veil of respectability over a thing in itself ignominious and un-Christian, and the results of its acceptance have recently been demonstrated to admiration.

Dualism is the destroyer of righteousness, and the Catholic philosophy of Sacramentalism is the antithesis of dualism. The sanctity of matter as the potential of Spirit and its dwelling place on earth; the humanizing of Spirit through its condescension to man through the making of his body and all created things its earthly tabernacle, give, when carried out into logical development, a meaning to life and a glory to the world and an elucidation of otherwise unsolvable mysteries, and an impulse towards noble living, neither Protestantism nor ever Christian Science can afford. It is a real philosophy of life, a standard of values, a criterion of all possible postulates, and as its loss

meant the world's death, so its recovery may mean its resurrection.

In harmony with this consummate philosophy, and as its inevitable corollary, came the whole Sacramental system of the Church, whereby every material thing was recognized as possessing in varying degree sacramental potentiality, while seven great sacraments were instituted to be, each after its own fashion, a special channel for the influx of the Power of God the Holy Ghost. Each was a symbol, a "phantasm" to use the word of Aristotle, just as so many other created things were, or could become, symbols, but beyond this they were realities, veritable *media* for the veritable communication of veritable Divine grace. Voided of power, reduced to the status of mere symbols, they become nothing; only the sentimental stimuli of personal emotion. There is no better definition of a Sacrament than that of Hugh of St. Victor "The Sacrament is the corporeal or material element set out sensibly, representing from its similitude, signifying from its institution, and containing from its sanctification, some invisible and spiritual grace." This is the unvarying and unvariable doctrine of the Catholic Church, and the reason for its existence as a living and fruitioning organism, and the very methods of its operation, follow from this supreme institution of the Sacraments. The whole Sacramental system is in a sense an extension of the Redemption, and one Sacrament, the Eucharist, also in a sense an extension of the Incarnation, just as it is also a daily, even hourly, extension *in time* of the Sacrifice of Calvary. The Church considered as simply the fellowship of the faithful is not an organism, it is an emotion. The Catholic Church is more than this; it is a living organism and as such it is subject to the definite, explicit and unchanging laws of its organic

system. What happens to the individual when he ceases to be a justly co-ordinated organism is demonstrated in countless insane asylums. What happens to the State under similar conditions is accomplished by Russia and is in process of evolution in Germany, if not throughout modern society. Indeed Protestantism itself is sufficient evidence of the disastrous results that follow from such an abnormal course.

The Incarnation and the Redemption are not accomplished facts, completed nineteen centuries ago, they are processes that still continue and their term is fixed only by the total regeneration and perfecting of Matter, and the Seven Sacraments are the chiefest amongst an infinity of Sacramental processes which are the agencies of this eternal transfiguration.

Christ not only became Incarnate to accomplish the Redemption of man as yet unborn for endless ages, through the completed Sacrifice of Calvary, but also to imitate a new method whereby the results were to be more perfectly attained; that is to say, the Church, working through the specific Sacramental agencies He had ordained or was later to ordain through His direction of the Church He had brought into being at Pentecost. He did not come to ordain a revolutionary code of ethics or even to offer in His own Person a new Model for human following. He was neither a newer Socrates nor an older Buddha but God Himself, revealing the whole system of life and the reason for the world, and, through the New Covenant of the Catholic Sacraments and the One, Indivisible Catholic Church preserved from error in its official determinations in Faith and morals, by virtue of His Presence therein until the consummation of the world, to fix this method of salvation in terms and under conditions identical with the process

of life itself, and in forms fitted to the comprehension of, and freely available for, every man that is born of woman.

He did not come to establish in material form a Kingdom of Heaven on earth or to provide for its ultimate coming. He indeed established a Spiritual Kingdom, His Church, "in the world, not of it," but this is a very different matter—as the centuries have proved. His Kingdom is not of this world, nor will it be established here. The folly and the conceit of nineteenth century evolutionists have received their quietus during the last few years. There has been no *absolute* advance in human development since the Incarnation, nor yet during the space of recorded history. Nations rise and fall, epochs wax and wane, civilizations grow out of savagery, crest, and sink back into savagery again. Redemption is for the individual, not for the race nor yet for society as a whole, nor even for matter itself *except* as this becomes definite and concrete in the individual, and there, and only there, and under that form, it is sure, however long may be the period of its accomplishment. "Time is the ratio of the resistance of matter to the interpenetration of Spirit" and by this resistance is the duration of time determined. When it shall have been wholly overcome then "Time shall be no more." God the Holy Ghost, proceeding from the Father, through the Son, and by the channel of each individual soul, operates directly on the matter which in human form is the object of redemption, and the Sacraments are not only the Divinely ordained agencies of this operation but the perfect symbols of life itself.

See therefore how perfect is the correspondence between the Sacraments and the method of life where they are the agents and which they symbolically set forth. There is in each case the material form and the spiritual substance

or energy. As Hugh of St. Victor says, each represents from its similitude, signifies from its institution, and contains from its sanctification some invisible and spiritual grace. Water, chrism, oil, the spoken word, the touch of the hands, the sign of the cross, and finally and supremely the bread and wine of Holy Mass, each a material thing but each representing, signifying and containing some gift of the Holy Spirit, real, absolute and potent. So matter and Spirit are linked together in every operation of Holy Church from the cradle to the grave, and man has ever before him the eternal revelation of this linked union of matter and spirit in his life, the eternal teaching of the honor of the material thing through its agency and through its existence as the subject for redemption, while through the material association and the Divine condescension to his earthly and fallible estate (limited by the association with matter to only inadequate perceptions), he makes the spirit of God his own to dwell therewith after the fashion of man.

As I have said elsewhere, "Man approaches, and must always approach, spiritual things not only through material forms but by means of material agencies. The highest and most beautiful things, those where the spirit seems to achieve its loftiest reaches, are frequently associated with the grossest and most unspiritual material forms, yet the very splendor of the spiritual verity redeems and glorifies the material agency, while on the other hand the homeliness and even animal quality of the material things brings, to man, with a poignancy and an appeal that are incalculable, the spiritual thing that in its absolute essence would be so far beyond his ken and his experience and his powers of assimilation that it would be imperative."

This is true Humanism, not the fictitious and hollow

thing that was the offering of Neo-Paganism and took to itself a title to which it had no claim. Held consciously or tacitly by the men of the Middle Ages from the immortal philosopher to the immortal but nameless craftsman, it was the force that built up the noble social structure of the time and poised man himself in a sure equilibrium. Already it had of necessity developed the whole scheme of religious ceremonial and given art a new content and direction through its new service. By analogy and association all material things that could be so used were employed as figures and symbols, as well as agencies through the Sacraments, and after a fashion that struck home to the soul through the organs of sense. Music, vestments, poetry and dramatic action, incense, candles, flowers, all were linked with the great arts of architecture, painting and sculpture, and all became not only ministers to the emotional faculties but direct appeals to the intellect through their function as poignant symbols. So art received its soul, and was almost a living thing until matter and spirit were again divorced in the death that severed them during the Reformation, and thereafter religion entered upon a period of slow dessecation and sterilization wherever the symbol was cast away with the Sacraments and the Sacramental philosophy that had made it live. Indifference or hostility to the pregnant and evocative and supremely beautiful ceremonial of the Catholic Faith is less ignorance of the meaning and function of art and an inherited hatred of its quality and its power, than they are the natural reactions of the conscious and determined rejection of the essential philosophy of the Catholic Church, which is Sacramentalism.

With the first perfecting of this philosophy during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries along the three parallel lines of Hugh of St. Victor, Duns Scotus and St. Thomas

Aquinas, came concurrently the brief but glorious flowering of Christian civilization from 1050 to 1300. It was then that not only philosophy, but theology, education, literature and all the old regenerated arts, and many new arts as well, achieved a sort of grand climacteric. It was during the same period that human society, political, industrial and economic, accomplished its highest perfection under Christianity, and the force widespread throughout the social organism concentrated itself in such focal points of dazzling light as St. Louis, St. Thomas and Dante, the Arthurian legend, the perfected Gregorian music and Reims Cathedral.

The whole Sacramental system of philosophy was of an almost sublime perfection and simplicity, and the Catholic Sacraments were both its goal and its types. If they had been of the same value and identical in nature they would have failed of perfect exposition, in the sense in which they were types or symbols. They were not this, for while six of the explicit seven were sufficiently of one mode, there was one where the conditions that held elsewhere were transcended and where, in addition to the two functions it was instituted to perform, it gave through its similitude the clear revelations of the most significant and pregnant fact in the vast mystery of life. I mean of course the most Holy Eucharist.

I desire to approach this consideration with the most complete abasement and profound reverence. I am not unmindful of the wise saying of St. Thomas A'Kempis, " 'Twere well not to inquire too curiously into the nature of this Sacrament," but it is impossible to complete the consideration of what is the essential philosophy of Christianity unless this point is made clear. The designation, the nomenclature, dates back perhaps no further than Hil-

debert of Tours in the eleventh century, the *fact* is attested as a theological and philosophical proposition by Paschalius Redburtus two centuries earlier; that is to say, in the time of Charlemange. I refer to the dogma of Transubstantiation as the expressing the manner whereby the Real Presence of God Incarnate is accomplished in the Holy Eucharist.

Now in the first place I wish to protest against two statements that are frequently made by those who are inimically disposed toward this doctrine. First, that it is only a quibbling over definitions that do not affect the fact; second, that defense of Transubstantiation is an affected and antiquarian attempt to restore a detail of an outworn scholasticism. I maintain that neither is true, but that on the contrary Transubstantiation meets a philosophical necessity inherent in the system of Sacramentalism which is afforded by no other assumption whatever. There are four possible theories: first, the Zwinglian, which as has been said actually amounts to the "real absence" and may be disregarded since it is contradicted by Christ Himself, has no place in historic Christianity back to the Apostolic Fathers, is rejected by *Ecclesia Anglicana* and even by the Lutheran and Westminster Confessions; second, the Lutheran, that is to say, consubstantiation; third, the theory of Osiander sometimes called "Impanation," where Christ is really present through an Hypostatic union; these last two covering, I suppose, the beliefs of the great majority of Anglicans; and there is finally the Catholic doctrine of Transubstantiation.

I am speaking now wholly from a philosophical standpoint. It is perhaps true that the doctrines of Osiander and Luther, as these are interpreted by Anglicans, are sufficient from a theological and a devotional standpoint. If

life is what it is held to be by the philosophy of the Catholic Church, then the Catholic theory (or dogma as it has been since the Council of Trent) is the only one which completes by its symbolism and its assertion of fact, the sacramental showing forth, through great symbols, of the nature of life.

Under all other interpenetration of this great Mystery, which is the crown of all the Sacraments, it does not differ from them except in degree; as in the case of the water of Baptism, the material agent remains unchanged, it is matter still, precisely as before the words and acts of Consecration. The wafer is still unleavened bread, the wine and water have not changed in character; they have simply become the vehicle whereby God gives Himself to man. At the most the substance, bread and the Substance, the Body of Christ, exist together after a mystical manner, i. e. through consubstantiation.

This doctrine of the Real Presence leaves the elements essentially unchanged, not only in their substance but in their accidents, but by spiritual interpenetration they become for the communicant, the offerer of the Holy Sacrifice, and those for whom it is offered, the Body and Blood of Christ. On the other hand, the Catholic doctrine is that by the act of Consecration the very substance of the bread and wine are transformed into an altogether different substance, the very Body and Blood of Christ, only the accidents of form, color, ponderability, etc. remaining.

It would be presumptuous for me to compare or contrast these two views of the Blessed Sacrament, from a religious standpoint. Speaking philosophically, the doctrine of transubstantiation certainly reveals and substantiates a great principle that may be the very secret of life itself and the reason for the existence of the world, while its abandonment by Protestants, not to mention infidels and agnostics,

lies close at the root of that materialism that has reached its logical climax in the present world-wide catastrophe.

If matter is forever matter, inert, unchangeable, indestructible, then it is hard to escape the sense of dualism in the universe: matter and spirit uniting in man as body and soul, in the sacraments as the vehicle and the essence, but temporally and temporarily, doomed always to ultimate severance either by death or by the completion of each sacramental process. Suppose, on the other hand, the object of the universe and of time is the constant redemption and transformation of matter, through its interpenetration by spirit through the power of God the Holy Ghost. Suppose that the miracle of Transubstantiation is but the type and showing forth of the incessant process of life whereby, every instant, matter itself is being changed and glorified, and transferred from the plane of matter—the earthplane—to the plane of spirit—the heavenly plane. Is not this the meaning of St. Paul's "There is an earthly body and there is a spiritual body; we are sown in corruption, we are raised in incorruptibility."

If this is so; if the Incarnation and Redemption are types and symbols of the Divine process forever proceeding here on earth, then while the other sacraments are in themselves not only agencies of grace, but manifestations of that process whereby in all things matter is used as the vehicle of the spirit, the Mass, transcending them all, is not only Communion, not only a Sacrifice for the quick and the dead acceptable before God, but it is also the unique symbol of the redemption and transformation of matter, since, of all the sacraments, it is the only one where the very physical qualities of the material vehicle are annihilated, and while the accidents alone remain, the substance, created, finite, perishable, becomes in an instant of time,

and by the Divine miracle of Transubstantiation, uncreated, infinite and immortal.

I confess that to me the Catholic argument is unanswerable and that only through this doctrine is the philosophy of Christianity rounded out to its fullness. "This is a hard saying: who shall hear it," and many go back and walk no more with Christ even as in the days when the words were spoken. "Verily, verily I say unto you, except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink His blood, ye have no life in you. Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day. For my flesh is meat indeed and my blood is drink indeed. He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me and I in him. As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father: so he that eateth me, even he shall live by me. This is that bread which came down from heaven: not as your fathers did eat manna, and are dead: he that eateth of this bread shall live forever."

We do well to look and work for a new brotherhood of man on earth as the crowning gift of the War: we do better when we pray and labor for the reunion of all Christendom in One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church, but neither the one nor the other is to be achieved unless to right religion we add a right philosophy. International covenants are ropes of sand, without international love, justice and fidelity, and there is no engine or device of Christian union that will be operative unless it is energized and consecrated by charity — *Caritas* — and a consistent, creative, sovereign philosophy of life. If we would have one or both, the Church and the Brotherhood—and both we must have if we are to escape the peril of a new Dark Ages—let us look to it that our religion is redeemed, our philosophy recreated, for otherwise neither individually nor

collectively, can we meet and turn back the new hordes of Huns and Vandals now gathering for another onslaught on an imperial but futile civilization—no more supreme and irresistible than that other their own kind brought to an end in fire and sack and slaughter just fifteen centuries ago.

I desire to make my plea for the restoration of the one Christian philosophy, in all its integrity and with nothing cut out or cast aside, solely on the ground of its everlasting truth, but even in the acceptance of truth and the establishing of justice there is expediency. As the first step towards a new world-order is a right philosophy—the power “to put things in their right place and control them well,”—so it has its bearings on matters that touch us at present very closely, and that must be adjusted without delay if we are to play our part in the new though almost desperate Crusade for the redemption of the Holy Places of human society. For the lack of a right philosophy (or for any philosophy whatever, for that matter), the Councillors of the Nations now assembled flounder and fall down, while the Nemesis of world-anarchy swiftly overtakes their chaotic deliberations. For the lack of a right philosophy we of *Ecclesia Anglicana*, parallel their courses, and have done so time out of mind. As the time came when America could no longer continue half slave and half free, so with us the time has come when neither charity nor expediency can permit the Church to continue along the lines of universal comprehension. The Great Testing is at hand and before that menace of incomparable potency the House of Salvation can not rest divided against itself. As it is religion alone, the religion of Christ crucified, that can save man at this juncture, so is it the Catholic Church, through its Sacraments and by the strength of its supporting philosophy, that alone can act as the engine of redemptive operation.

In the red light of menacing dissolution every predilection, every prejudice, every personal conviction, all except the solemn and unmistakable mandate of conscience alone must be sacrificed and cast aside. The unity of the Church in the Catholic Faith and under Catholic Authority is the instant and desperate necessity.

To this end the first step is the explicit acceptance of the Catholic doctrine of the Sacraments, and the Catholic philosophy of Sacramentalism, with Holy Mass as the true Communion of the true Body and Blood of Christ, as an ever new Sacrifice acceptable before God for the sins of the whole world, and as, in the words of St. Thomas, "the end and aims of all the Sacraments," with Transubstantiation as the sufficient expression of the manner of Christ's Presence therein.

I think it is the lack of this clear consciousness, theologically and philosophically, that is answerable for the vacillating and compromising courses we are disposed to follow, now at this critical moment when we realize that unity in the Church is closely bound up with the great problem whether civilization, even society itself, is to continue except after a second five centuries of Dark Ages. Rightly and honorably we look on the one hand towards the Protestant denominations, on the other towards all those in Communion with the Apostolic See, tentatively approaching them with well-meant advances, in the desperate hope that so we may have some part in the restoration of Catholic unity. I cannot avoid the conviction that the lack of a definite philosophy has much to do with the variousness of these approaches and the very great unwisdom of some amongst them. A case in point is the question of the acceptance of Episcopal order on the part of those bodies that have rejected it and still protest they desire it not at all. It ap-

pears that both in England and America propositions have from time to time been made that practically amount to this: that if the Protestant bodies will only accept the Episcopate as a fact, no questions will be asked as to its nature and function. Now under correction I maintain that this is a case of failing "to put things in their right order and control them well." If the Episcopate represented simply a form of order and government, even with Divine sanction and institution, this might be possible, but in that case I submit we should have no moral right to impose it as an absolute condition, when the question of unity is involved. The doctrine of the Catholic Church is not this, however. The Episcopate has two functions, one of which is the supreme governance of the faithful, but the other and primary function is the transmission to certain men of the Power of the Holy Ghost for the work of a priest in the Church of God; that is to say, first of all for administering the Sacraments of Baptism, Penance, Matrimony and Unction, and, above all, the Communion of the Body and Blood of Christ and the offering of the Holy Sacrifice. In other words, it is not the *fact* of Episcopacy that matters, it is the *function*, and the chief function of the Bishop is the making of priests who can consecrate the Eucharist, forgive sins, and offer the Holy Sacrifice of the Altar.

If then we had a clear and unanimous theological conviction fortified by an equally clear philosophy, we should say to the ministers of those whom we euphemistically call "our separated brethren," not "Accept our Bishops and let them have the privilege of ordaining you after their own fashion and we will ask no embarrassing questions as to what you think of it all, or even if you believe you have so gained nothing you did not have before," but rather, "You are now a duly accredited 'minister of the Gospel;' do you want to

be made a priest? If you do, if you want to act as the agent of God, through the Power of the Holy Ghost to perform the Divine miracle of changing bread and wine into the very Body and Blood of Christ; if you want to gain power for the remitting of sins, and if you want to offer the Holy Sacrifice of the altar for the quick and the dead and for the sins of the whole world—*then* you will accept the fact and the authority of the Episcopate, and the laying on of hands whereby alone a priest is made by the covenant of God.

So also would it be in the case of laymen, who no longer would "come into the Church" because they had ritualistic leanings, or preferred another social atmosphere, or for any other of the many causes now operative. They would come because they wanted to confess their sins and receive absolution, because they wanted to feed on Christ Himself through Holy Communion, because they desired to join with the priest in offering the Sacrifice of the Mass for themselves, for their dead, and for the world.

From the lack of a right philosophy our theology is led along divergent lines of strange variation, our order and discipline are weakened to the point of nullity, and even our religion fails of its fullest possibilities, and I know of no way in which *Ecclesia Anglicana* can rise to its vast opportunity at a moment when its peculiar qualities are most needed for the energizing of a true *Vita Nuova*, than by the return to that Sacramental philosophy of the Middle Ages which is the only sufficient system and the only intellectually adequate system thus far revealed to man.

From such acceptance, or from the conscious desire for it and progress towards it, will follow of necessity certain acts and ordinances, for every spiritual thing has its material expression. The Mass as the one obligatory service

of worship, and accepted both as Communion and Sacrifice. Formal recognition of marriage as a Sacrament and therefore indissoluble, the restoration of Sacramental confession as the normal method of spiritual reconciliation. Above all, the establishing of Reservation of the Blessed Sacrament, not only for sick-calls but for specifically private and public adoration, as the recognized custom in every cathedral and parish church. I should perhaps urge the last as the most immediately necessary of all. Where the Sacrament is reserved there is no doubt as to the Catholic faithfulness of priest and people, and as matters rest with us today, it is necessary that the Church should stand forth from her cowardice and time-serving of an olden age to bear witness to the truth of the Incarnation and the Redemption as these are shown forth in the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ. Not only does the presence of Christ in the tabernacle transform a church from an echoing conventicle into the very courts of God; not only does it teach mutely but potently as no human voice can do; not only does it lead irresistibly on to the exaltation of the Mass as the one Supreme Sacrament and to the other six as of equal authority and obligations; it is also, and for my present purpose most essentially, the explicit, visible teaching of that Philosophy which alone can lead men "to put things in their right order and control them well," so perhaps averting from us the Nemesis of our own follies and falsities, now increasingly indicated in the Apocalyptic happenings of the world.

I ask then a return, explicit and uncompromising, to that Philosophy of life which was the crowning intellectual glory of the great era of the Middle Ages when Christianity was fully operative; to that philosophy which completed, in unity and perfection, that Catholic religion that had issue

in a righteous and beneficent social system, in a political estate marked by justice and liberty, and in a great and incomparable plexus of all the arts that flowered at last in that Cathedral of Our Lady of Reims which its antithesis, incarnate in modernism, could only desecrate and destroy.

Sarah Frances Smiley

An Impression

BY MRS. HARLAN CLEVELAND.

ON Tuesday, July 24, 1917, in the communion of the Catholic Church, and in the confidence of a certain faith, Sarah Frances Smiley passed beyond mortal life, in the eighty-eighth year of her age.

By will she left to the Society for the Home Study of Holy Scripture and Church History, the little sum of which she died possessed, one of the provisions of her will being that no story of her life should be written.

It is with no thought of infringing upon the privacy which she desired, or of breaking in spirit or letter the least of her injunctions, that I would gather up a little friendly loving posy of memories by way of tribute to her strong and faithful personality. It must be fragmentary and personal, for no material has been left of dates and facts, or events, as a framework upon which to hang my wreath of rosemary. On the other hand, with little of detail to hold one down, it is difficult in dwelling upon the impression of Sarah Frances Smiley, not to be carried away at once into the atmosphere of all the mighty things for which she stood and for which she strove.

Yet is my first impression sufficiently concrete, for memory, slipping down slanting bypaths of past years, lands

me abruptly in mid-afternoon of a spring day of my childhood. All is quite clear,—the mid-western suburban village with its winding roads, and tall forest trees, a legacy of pioneer days. The spire of the Presbyterian Church cutting the sky from its solid brick four square of sure salvation while “the little experiment on the hill” of Episcopal sanction, expresses a somewhat wavering witness to the older way. Here is the old grey-gabled home amid the oaks and elms and spruce trees. The grass is a young green, and the odor of lilacs is borne on a strong breeze; three children casting away school books, and hats, on the wide stone steps of the piazza, run shouting over the grass, breasting the wind, with arms wide, as if it were indeed the sea, of which little inland children dream. The return of the swimmers up the sloping lawn, with wind-blown hair, brings them breathless to the door to meet the dear and stately mother as she comes in from the afternoon Bible Reading at the Presbyterian Church. So entering all together into the book-lined library, we are told of the wonderful little Quaker lady, in cap and kerchief, who had given the Bible Reading. Thus I hear for the first time the name of Sarah Frances Smiley. It was many years before I heard that name again, but when the need was urgent, she who had travelled far in the meantime, was ready again to lead the way. It must have been about this time, or a little later, that she passed through the most trying ordeal of her life in renouncing the Friends’ Faith, and stood forth openly for an objective, rather than a subjective Religion. This she did fearfully, yet boldly in Friends’ Meeting.

Miss Smiley’s life could be divided into three distinct sections: the first a youth of mystic Quaker piety and active good works; the second a period of intellectual flowering,

when she was well known as Bible Reader and Lecturer among Friends, and more widely among Protestants; and the third period, embracing her forty years of fruition when she had found the Faith, and built up the Library and its work.

Miss Smiley was born in Maine on March 30, 1830, and was educated by Susan Howland of New Bedford. After graduation she taught in the same school, and afterwards in a fashionable Friends' school in Philadelphia. During the Civil War she carried relief to "Friends" in South Carolina, and returned to Washington the morning after the assassination of President Lincoln. The train stopped in the night, and the news was told in the hush of sudden silence. The next day, and until the funeral, four generals of the Union Army kept guard about the bier of the President, and with them were stationed four members of the Society of Friends—and one of the four was Sarah Frances Smiley. Somewhat later she was sent to carry relief to a district in Minnesota devastated by forest fires.

Always a student, and always a teacher, she soon gained recognition, and was sent as a lecturer and Bible reader to many churches in America, and during this second period also to tour England among the communities of Friends. In 1877 she published in London two little books—lessons from Joshua—called "Fullness of Blessing" and "Garden Graith." She was well acquainted with the Gurneys and Elizabeth Fry, but most important of all she began to come in contact with Anglican thought and ideals. Many of the books and commentaries she studied were written from the standpoint of the Oxford Movement.

So it was from the silent mysticism of the religion of Friends, of which she always spoke with loving respect, she avidly read herself through and beyond Protestantism

back to the position of the Early Fathers. After her conversion she studied in England under Canon Body, and came into intimate contact with the always beloved Canon Carter. Under such guidance she built her conservative Catholic faith into a complete and rounded theology. Her devotion to Canon Carter was loyal and tender. She has told me of how the Catholic position was threshed out in many conversations, until every detail of dogmatic faith was a part of her very being; of lists of questions prepared by her and answered by Canon Carter; of his eschatology, which followed too closely the Apostolic School to be popular today.

As she had reached her position through books and study, she felt that books and study were to be the weapons of her spiritual warfare, and set to work with much enthusiasm though small means to gather a library, and found in America a school of *Anglican* learning. In 1889, with the approval and support of the Bishop of Albany, the Society for Home Study of Holy Scripture and Church History was incorporated. There was a library of Anglican learning, and a four year course of study prepared. A silver Jerusalem Cross was the badge of honor worn by those who completed this course with examinations. There were Readers' Courses also for those who could not give the necessary time for the more difficult courses, and Miss Smiley gave herself with unstinted devotion to correspondence with her students, and the leading of American womanhood into this new adventure of intellectual and spiritual discipline. This early work of the society was chosen in connection with St. Anna's Hall, a house of Retreat and Study opened by Miss Smiley near the General Theological Seminary and under the supervision of Canon Body and other professors of the seminary.

Those who in the eighties for the first time read translations of the early Fathers of the Church, or were introduced to the beauties of Lacordaire, or Lowth, or studied the notes of Christopher Wordsworth,—out-poeting the poet himself,—those who reaped the spiritual harvest so painstakingly prepared by our dear leader, and only they, can appreciate the value and usefulness of the Anglican Library to the American home during certain dry years of the closing century. During the years when the Presbyterian Communion was clinging desperately to a barren verbal inspiration as her sole anchor against the surging of modern opinion, and was casting out her Jonahs from the ship,—while Briggs wrote “Whither?”, and went to Union, and the intellectuals grew bold in denial of the Virgin birth, and the sheep were naturally confused by the varying calls of the shepherds,—here and there a mother shut in with a family of little children was taking a precious half-hour daily poring over the Library books, or a conscientious Sunday School teacher was really giving her class something constructive, because of her home reading; others who had faithfully passed the four year course of study were taking up the work of teaching by correspondence, under Miss Smiley’s management. Through many years this quiet work went on, and was surely one of many means of awakening which have shaken the materialism of America and made us conscious of a destiny higher than success.

Through all those years there was a steady drift—shall I call it drift?—from the many Protestant sects back into the old ways. Here and there a devout and gentle priest would tell one of coming from the Baptist or Presbyterian Communion, influenced by reading the Oxford Tracts; a third of our Confirmation classes came from other

churches, so that we were called proselyters. Not all came because of the orderly and acceptable service; some came in spite of it, rushing on to ritual excesses which without the balance of sane Catholic teaching too often landed them in Rome. Many came and remained, realizing the strategic position of the American Episcopal Church as the great battle-ground for both Faith and Freedom!

No one but Miss Smiley herself ever could know with what painstaking care and sacrifice and economy that Library was built up, or the difficulties and family prejudices which she encountered; for her brothers, strong and forceful men in their own faith, could not bring themselves to aid her in any way in her work. An allowance for her own needs was always generously provided, and from this allowance, and the fees from her students, she gradually built up her Library to six thousand precious volumes.

She spent many summers in the mountain and lake regions where her brothers kept their famous hotels at Mohonk and Minnewaska, where a tremendous success waited upon these heroes in the hotel field, who dared prohibit the bar, card playing, and dancing at a pleasure resort. The Smileys were all dogmatic, and lived faithfully the doctrines they believed. It is the more to their credit, that differing so widely in their beliefs, they should have kept the core of charity.

At the time of a summer Conference at Mohonk, when the Chinese Minister, Wu Ting Fang was a delegate — I think about the year '88 — an incident occurred which gave Miss Smiley great pleasure to recall.

It was a fine summer morning, and the guests were leaving the breakfast table one by one until only three people were left, Mr. Smiley at the head of his table discussing the Tenets of the Friends' Faith with his interested Chi-

nese listener upon his right, while Sarah Frances sat silent, but with negation in her eyes, upon his left. Mr. Wu turned to her, saying:

"But you, you have not the same religion?"

"No," she said; "I believe in the Old Christianity."

"Aye, but thee is quite wrong, sister," said Mr. Smiley.

So the discussion ended until Mr. Smiley finished his coffee, and rose from the table. Wu Ting Fang rose also, and coming around the table's end, sat down in the empty chair beside Miss Smiley, saying:

"Now tell me about *your* religion!"

"That is not easy in a casual conversation," she answered. "First tell me what you know about my religion."

"I can tell you what I do not like about your religion. You put my venerable ancestors burning in hell—and they were good men!"

Thus she had her cue from the reverent celestial, and expounded the Catholic Faith as to ancestors—beginning with prayers for the dead! When they parted, and he returned to Washington, his good-bye to her was, "I like your religion."

While not a Christian, Wu Ting Fang has always been friendly to western ideals, and a leading Republican. At a banquet of students held before the outbreak of the Revolution, he made the startling statement that there was no hope for China until the government was in the hands of enlightened young men, such as he was addressing. In 1911 it was to meet Wu Ting Fang that Yuan Shi Ki sent his representative to arrange the Peace Conference between Old China and China of the Revolution. In 1916 Wu Ting Fang was put in charge of the Chinese Foreign Office, and cabled from Peking his desire for friendly and cordial relations with America and Americans. Enclosing

the newspaper clipping announcing his advance to this high office, Miss Smiley wrote jubilantly:

"I think you will be glad to see this little slip respecting Minister Wu. You see that it falls to his office to maintain the relations with our missionaries, and when I recall not so much the words, as the tone and manner of the man—'*I like your religion*'—I feel sure that he will give them all the help he can. It surely was a wonderful opening God gave me, for if I had gone to China and spent five years there I probably could not have done more. I have been looking for him to come into power again, and for us it is the most important position he could hold."

Miss Smiley's temperament was naturally serious; she was easily disturbed and made anxious, yet always her little friendly notes were full of jubilation over some new and delightful goodness of God. In one letter she wrote to a friend whose son went to France with Pershing's Army:

"May I try a bit to cheer you by telling of two English officers in whom I am deeply interested? One of them is the Earl of Haddington. The announcement of his father's death and his succession, which I saw lately, shows that he is still alive. I knew his mother, and loved her dearly. She was the sister of Mother Julian of Truro. I have some very wonderful letters from her. Soon after I left Truro in 1886, came that short terrible war in North Africa, and her only son was there. Her one constant prayer for him was, 'Cover his head in the day of battle.' After a long anxiety they sent me the message, 'His helmet had been shot off his head without the singeing of a hair!' And now he is somewhere in command."

"This very day I have cut from the *Times* the portrait of Sir Archibald Murray, the Commander in Chief of the British Forces in Egypt. I knew him as a

splendid boy of about eight years. His father held what is considered one of the finest estates in Scotland—Ochteshire—and his sister invited me to spend two weeks with her, their mother having died. The place had come down for five hundred years without a break from father to son—in Christian households. I was afterwards with their aunt in her little villa at Mentone, and so kept up my interest in the boy. The *Guardian* gives lists showing the absolute extinction of so many noble families that one must believe that these two men of whom by a strange chance I know, owe their preservation to the prayers of their kindred.”

One other picture perhaps would not be a betrayal of confidence, since it is connected with the perpetuation of the Library, and was told to me among many others of the little personal mercies which made so intimate and lovely a relationship to her Saviour. Such tender and small providences come into every life—some call them coincidences, others, more happy, discern the loving care of a Father’s hand. To Miss Smiley every incident which touched her beloved Library was a matter of moment.

The loss of certain numbers of an old and invaluable file of magazines gave her days and nights of distress, and when after having given up the search as quite in vain, she saw in a book catalogue of second-hand books an announcement for sale of the very magazines missing from her file, she read it as if it had been written in letters of gold.

As the Library had never been more than barely self-supporting, and her allowance came from an annuity, she endeavored before her death to raise an endowment fund for the support of the Library, and the buying of books. This fund did not increase very rapidly, and as she grew old and her brother became feeble, her anxiety for the fu-

ture of the Library was acute, and she spent one sleepless night pacing her floor and praying aloud from the depth of her specific need, that God might put it into the heart of her brother to give her just five thousand dollars to use for her Library. In the midst of her pleading a sudden peace penetrated her heart, and she went to bed and slept soundly until morning. Six months later, on the death of her brother, a codicil to his will was found, dated on that forgotten night of prayer, leaving "to my sister Sarah, the sum of five thousand dollars to use as she may choose. May it be blest to the largest fulfillment of her hopes!" She made her choice and her will at once, leaving her little prayer fortune to the Society for the Home Study of Holy Scriptures and Church History.

Perhaps that old, kindly, but positive Quaker saint, her brother, also had his night of struggle and renunciation, before writing that precious codicil, and it may have seemed to him a weakness in himself that he felt so impelled to sign away any of his righteously earned money to be used, as he believed, in the interest of the scarlet woman of Rome. If kindly affection triumphed over conviction that night, it is a joy now to think of those two strong souls united in aim as in love in Paradise, as they never could be on earth. But the Library trustees could find it in their hearts to wish that Miss Smiley had prayed that night for ten thousand!

A life should always be judged on its constructive side, and Miss Smiley was active and busy planning for the Library, and collecting books on the Russian Church—over two hundred volumes—to the end; but perhaps the things she left undone during those last years of her student life are as full of significance for us today as the things she did.

There came a time while Miss Smiley still lived, when the work of the Library seemed to fall off. The founder refused to listen to the new learning, which everywhere suggested change, and criticism. While the hurrying motors of New York rolled from East to West and West to East, following the latest popular professor expounding modern criticism, pricking traditional bubbles, and tickling the intellectual vanity of his hearers—than which there is none more dangerous—Sarah Frances Smiley sat placidly in her low arm-chair by her reading desk at 20 Fifth avenue, poring over book catalogues indeed, but refusing to buy any of the modern Critical School. She read them through—a few! I have heard her quote at length, with a merry twinkle in her humorous and kindly eyes, some preposterous theory from some of the most advanced and solemn thinkers of the German school. Who will say now that she was not wise in her conservatism during those five or six years before 1914, since one at least of the foremost English critics has spent painful and repentant days in re-writing in his age the message of his robust years?

The Anglican Library during Miss Smiley's lifetime stood always for the Faith once delivered to the Saints, with whatever light of experience and mystical wisdom has been shed upon it down the ages by the wise and learned of many days. And it is the hope of the Trustees that the Library Courses shall always stand for just that,—the Catholic Faith with all that learning and scholarship can do to adorn it by adding—not indeed to the Faith—but to the light by which we grasp the Faith.

In July of 1917 I came to town after a few weeks' absence, and so had the privilege of seeing Miss Smiley during the last days of her life, and of doing something for her comfort. The end was peculiarly peaceful and quiet,

and to one who knew her carefulness and her fears for the beloved Library, it was a proof of her strong faith that she could lay aside those cares so easily. Our little talks were not of plans and future work, but of her last communion, and the goodness of her kind nurse.

The Library was left in the hands of eight Trustees, whose President is the Bishop of New Jersey. A new day was dawning, new methods were necessary, new courses were needed, to meet the modern demand. The reorganization has taken time and work. There have been difficulties which could only be met by sound scholarship. All the theology of the last decade is more or less infected with German thought, no longer trusted; it was even said gayly of the Oxford of 1913 — "They are all Atheists there!" Since the beginning of the war a well-merited contempt for intellectual processes without morality has been growing. It has not been the intention of the Trustees to change the principles of the S. H. S. H. S., but only to modify and modernize its methods. The old courses may always be had for the asking. The courses in Church History and Christian Classics are perhaps especially to be commended as unchangeably good. The first of the new courses to be presented is that on the New Testament. A Manual for the New Testament, prepared by the Rev. Scott Easton, D.D., Professor of the New Testament at the Western Theological Seminary, Chicago, is in the hands of the printer. Preliminary Reading on both the Old and New Testament is already listed and may be had by applying to the Director.

The new Director and Organizing Secretary is Miss Gladys Baldwin, 164 Waverly Place, New York. She is a daughter both of England and America. Her childhood was spent in Oxford, where her father was Professor of Oriental Languages. Like old Aschem's princess pupil, she

is young and learned; characteristics which have their uses in others as well as in Sydney's sister—though certain others, present in both, may of course be ignored in a really serious paper.

The Russian Library and Courses are in charge of the Rev. Professor Leicester Lewis, at the Western Theological Seminary, Chicago. The professors will charge a fee for criticism and examination by correspondence. These fees are in addition to Library dues. Library membership is one dollar a year, with payment of postage on books sent through the mails. The Old Courses may be had for one dollar. Preliminary Reading in the New Courses for two dollars and a half, and full privilege in the Library for five dollars. The New Courses and Manuals are subject to the advice and selection of the Very Rev. H. E. W. Fosbroke, D.D., Dean of the General Theological Seminary. We offer Seminary Courses and Examinations by the professor who gives the course.

To the clergy in lonely places, far from the inspiration of intellectual association, to women in the home everywhere, to Girls' Friendly Societies, to business women who have free evenings to give to reading and study, to all who feel the need of more definite teaching, to all earnest souls who would study the Bible as it is, the Trustees heartily recommend the Courses of the Anglican Library. We, who are modern, must study the old Faith with the moderns, but it must not be a false or superficial modernism. No other work of this kind is being done in the Church in America. In England there are the Archbishop's Courses, quite beyond the scholarship of most American women, and also the S. P. C. K. Manuals. But here in America, where the distances are so great, and therefore the need so much the greater, there is no other agency elastic enough to cover the

whole ground and give, in the waste places, as in the crowded centers, thorough and efficient teaching in the theology of the Catholic Church.

Two hundred thousand women in our Communion answered the Advent Call to Prayer. If two hundred thousand American women should answer this call to united, careful, prayerful study under trained and orthodox teachers, who knows how soon Jerusalem might be builded in our green land? Women of America! Let us unite, as our sons have united, in one stupendous effort to realize the might of coöperation. Let us to Bethlehem, as to a Plattsburg, and build us a barrack of books. Let us know what we believe, that others may believe through our certainty.

Now may the soul of Sarah Frances Smiley rest in peace, and her work, through the students of the Anglican Library, follow her.

The Morality of Interest

BY HERBERT PARRISH.

IT is apt to be forgotten, or it is not generally known, that the morality of interest has a history. In view of the present clamor against capitalism—the vague promises of parlor socialists, the denunciations of soap-box orators—this history may be worth recalling. We are too apt to take for granted that so well-established a thing will stand without defense.

The morality of interest is a development. Like steam-engines, machinery, and other inventions of modern civilization—and in consequence of them—the loaning of money

at interest has become recognized as morally right in spite of entrenched opposition, against bitter prejudice, and in the face of official authority. If we change this established custom now we shall reverse the wheels of time and return to the Middle Ages. In an age of Trotskys the contingency is not inconceivable. The tearing out of this plank by legislative enactment, or the weakening of security by the pressure of labor's demands, will turn the world back to the days of horse-drawn vehicles and triremes more suddenly than can be imagined.

The condemnation of the custom of taking interest on loans was a characteristic of the Middle Ages. For fifteen hundred years the Christian world of western Europe regarded the custom as immoral. Then it gradually changed its mind. It had valid reason. Russia, not having advanced far from mediævalism, never did change its moral view on the subject—which may account for the rapid success of certain theories of Bolshevism there.

The Christian Church, from the time of Nicaea on, condemned all interest as usury. All teachers of morals, theologians, doctors, Popes, and Councils, the Fathers, east and west alike—Athanasius, Basil the Great, Gregory of Nazianzum, Gregory of Nyssa, Cyril of Jerusalem, Epiphanius, John Chrysostom, Theodoret, Hilary, Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine, Leo the Great—speak of the taking of interest as a sin comparable to theft, sacrilege, or the desecration of the dead. The Council of Nicaea, which sat just a month after the Emperor Constantine had legalized interest at the rate of one per cent a month, quoted Psalm 15:6, and ordered any cleric guilty of lending money at this then very low rate to be deposed and stricken from the list. Later councils continued to condemn the practice. Christian kings enforced these edicts.

The mediæval mind, making no distinctions between the various kinds of money-lending, concluded that interest was offensive to God, based its opinion on passages in the Bible,—Ex. 22:25, 25:36, Deut. 23:19, 20, Ps. 15:6, St. Luke 6:34,—and fortified these with quotations from Plato, Aristotle, Cicero, and Seneca. And, except in certain instances, this attitude was reasonable enough. Money, after the decline of the Empire, had no market value. It was really “barren.” It could be used only as a medium of private exchange, for housekeeping. It had to be kept hoarded in strong-boxes or buried in cellars. What with bad roads, sparse population, slight manufacturing, little agriculture, less mining, dangerous travelling, robbers on land and sea, there was no inducement for a man to deny himself and save money in order that he might venture in the hope of gain. If he saved at all he saved for old age or for some special occasion of expense. If he lent it was merely to tide a neighbor over some necessity. Money had no more value than any other household article. And you could not ask interest on the loan of a kettle.

Of course there were exceptions. Kings needed money for wars. Desideratus, Bishop of Verdun, applied to King Theodebert for money to relieve his impoverished diocese—and promised to pay “cum usuris legitimis.” The Venetian bankers did some business as early as 1270. It was not so reprehensible to borrow as it was to lend. And the Jews (Deut. 23: 20) who were permitted to lend to “a stranger” became the money-lenders of the times and gained with their exorbitant interests the universal hatred. But in general the attitude in theory and practice of Church and State alike was that the taking of interest under any circumstances whatever was, as the Fifth Lateran Council expressed it, a mean “attempt to draw profit and incre-

ment, without labor, without cost, and without risk, out of the use of a thing that does not fructify."

Even as late as 1789 the laws of France forbade the taking of interest. In the year 1745, in a last effort to stem the tendency of the times, Pope Benedict XIV wrote: "That kind of sin which is called usury, and which has its proper seat and place in the contract of *mutuum* (i. e. loan for a definite period), consists in turning that contract, which of its own nature requires the amount returned exactly to balance the amount received, into a ground for demanding a return in excess of the amount received."

But already the general practice of mankind had outstripped the dogmatic utterances of religion and the formal permissions of legislatures. Before the close of the sixteenth century the changed conditions of the world in western Europe had brought out the possibilities of money into a new light. Discovery, invention, commerce, and other enterprises were creating a market value for money, and men were beginning to take a chance by outfitting an adventurous trader here and a poor but honest manufacturer there on the promise of a multiplied return. John Calvin, fierce reformer, approved of the break with tradition and in spite of the opposition of Luther and Melancthon, made a distinction between "interest" and "usury" which salved consciences then and has lasted until our own day. In the eighteenth century Scipio Maffei wrote his *Dell' impiego del danaro* which had a great effect in changing the ecclesiastical attitude, and in 1830 Pius VIII decided—what the rest of the world had already known—that those who considered the taking of interest allowed by state law justifiable, were "not to be disturbed." The Bank of Amsterdam had been running since 1609 and the Bank of England since 1694.

Thus it came about that the taking of interest from being regarded as a sin arrived at eminent respectability. The Roman Catholic Church, following John Calvin (!), saved its face by making a distinction between "interest" and "usury."

"The laws of conscience," said Montaigne, "which we pretend to be derived from nature, proceed from custom."

While land is purchasable, commerce safe, trade active, communication swift, inventions lucrative, manufacturing and mining developed, population dense, travel secure, robbers restrained, and men trustworthy, people will save money for the sake of investment by virtue of what is after all rather a natural law than a mere custom. No amount of Uplift piffle or Utopian talk will affect the tendency. The Middle Ages, like Russia today, had none of these conditions, and consequently money then could only be used for exchange or to hoard.

If the cry of Proudhon, "Property is theft," caught up by a million wild Bolsheviki, prevails, then the stable conditions of civilization will be shaken and time will rush back a thousand years. Interest will again become immoral because it will be impossible.

Property is not theft; it is the legitimate fruit of abstinence and self-denial. This is a truth which the Church ought to affirm more actively.

The Implications of an Ancient Rhyme

BY THE REV. HENRY S. WHITEHEAD, M.A.

THERE is always a certain element of truth in proverbs or similar sayings because these are statements of crystallized opinion, and an opinion held so widely as to result in a proverb is extremely likely to be near the centre of things. Such a statement is that rather thin, doggerel triplet which attempts to summarize the characteristics of the three traditional Anglican schools of churchmanship:

“High and crazy;
Low and lazy;
Broad and hazy.”

That brilliant oddity, Ronald A. Hilary Knox, ex-priest of the Church of England, and now of the papal obedience, in an article written for the *Dublin Review* shortly after his secession, in the summer of 1918, pointed out that there are, actually, no less than seven varieties of Anglican churchmanship. As we gaze about us and take thought, we can hardly help finding that Knox erred on the side of conservatism. We wonder why, if he were going to apply his firework mind to a critical summarizing of the Anglican schools of thought, he should have stopped at expanding the traditional number three into the mystical number seven. We cannot help thinking that such limitation is altogether too conservative; but healthful reaction brings us, like a bee to the landing-board to the conclusion that, generally speaking there are three, and just three such schools, and that the triplet lines ending in “azy” describe them pretty well. Really deep thought will be likely to confirm this view.

Now there are certain dangers in telling the naked truth, as everyone knows. And these dangers are not limited to the social errors involved, nor to the apparent absurdities which this unfortunate habit so frequently lands one in. There are the subtler dangers, such as are being so constantly braved by an incurable truth-teller like Mr. Chesterton: the danger of being thought a purveyor of comic articles; the danger of not being taken seriously; the danger of being considered insincere; the great danger of degenerating in the public mind, into a dealer in paradoxes, for it is not until one gets down to an apparent contradiction (as that great teacher Brooke Foss Westcott used to warn his pupils), that you can be reasonably certain of being on the right track.

Even a clever essayist like Mr. Chesterton loses heavily because the reading public — even essay readers — can be quite readily shocked and surprised by the appearance of naked truth. Therefore a clumsy person must make his attempt at telling the truth with a foregone certainty that his excursion into that fantastic realm where things are stated as they are, will be over a stony road.

It seems to the writer that the words crazy, lazy, and hazy do pretty well describe the internal situation with which we have to deal in that portion of the Holy Catholic Church legally described as the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America. Probably everyone who has ever heard this simple rhyme was at once impressed with the fact that it did describe the three kinds of churchmanship. Probably every reader will agree with the writer that the author of this jingle was a person of insight who knew what was apt and what was meet. So far, good. But to look ahead and face the results of applying these tests of character, crazy, lazy, and hazy, in a seri-

ous and truthful way—ah! that is a horse of another color.

We begin, then, with the high and crazy. Crazy here, obviously means not so much lop-sided, as in "crazy quilt," or as the word would be applied to a scarecrow with its inherent lack of symmetry, or to a very old house which has wilted and fallen out of plumb so as to present many irregular angularities, as it does demented, possessed, queer in the head. The plain intention of the author of the line of verse is that High churchmen are not queer in their angles or physical postures, but queer in their relation to what approximated the established order in the days when these lines were given to the world. In other words, a High churchman is a kind of fanatic. This is true, and may all who are denominated High thank God devoutly for it! The High churchman is, plainly, a different kind of churchman from his lazy and hazy fellow Anglicans. He goes at the things concerned in churchmanship—his worship particularly—in a manner which is unusual and hence comic. Therefore he is crazy. He does not jog along in the cut-and-dried, traditional Anglicanism of the eighteenth century; he desires a restoration to the activities and practices of an era which was not cut-and-dried, and as this appears new and strange, the High churchman, who for some inexplicable reason likes it that way, is crazy. He rakes up a number of usages which it would be much less trouble to let alone, and when he has them resurrected and in working order they resemble somewhat, on the surface, the outward and visible performances of those irrational and inexplicable Romanists, and clearly he is crazy. He breaks away from the worship of a comfortable, good-natured deity, who has grown rather sleepy, and who is perfectly satisfied, of course, with the old cut-and-dried mumble of services, and the old, easy-going semi-disregard of himself,

and the entirely cut-and-dried, respectable, middle-class lives of his mundane adherents; all of which is a great deal of trouble and quite unnecessary; and so the High churchman is crazy. He substitutes a quite different God as the object of his worship, he frames his life upon the principle of union with Him, he is abundantly careful to do Him honor by frequent elaborate and appropriate services, lives lived in a carefully preserved state of grace, costly fabrics and furniture as well as a growing good taste in houses of worship; he allies himself with the long-neglected arts, he goes to work for God,—indubitably he is crazy, crazy as he can be. He is a fanatic.

Now it is just this fanaticism for God, like that of the "High" churchman, that seems to be needed. The external evidence is that the lazy and hazy methods have failed every time they have been tried. As far back as history takes us, the cut-and-dried methods of the hidebound religionist like Secker and the fanciful inadequacies of the inexact or semi-believing religionist like Paul of Samosata have failed, as indeed they deserved to fail. Always it is the fanatic who succeeds. David, Mohammed, The Mahdi, Dolling, Savonarola, Wesley, Ignatius Loyola, the Tai Ping group (not to multiply instances)—all these got somewhere in and with their religion. As soon as the fanaticism of the fervent believer—for it is a matter of belief—has evaporated, then haziness or laziness sets in, and there is a let-down, succeeded by formalism, professionalism, decadence,—finally death, quiet, uninteresting, and unmourned.

The lazy come next under our consideration for a brief examination. There is no necessity for a definition. Lazy is lazy. But it is possible for a person to be lazy in part and in part otherwise. A man may be a lazy churchman and a highly successful plumber. Or he may be, in the case of a

minister, of the type of the Fox-Hunting Parson lamented by the late James Anthony Froude. It is something like the latter or his more modern descendant who spends Lent at Atlantic City, I shrewdly suspect, that was in the mind of the author of our jingle. I think he must have meant the kind of churchman who cared so little for his religion that he contented himself with going through the motions, the minimum of motions. I think he had in mind the comfortable, socially presentable, somewhat worldly, easy-going parson; and the comfortable, socially presentable, somewhat worldly, easy-going congregation of that parson. These, he says, are the low.

It is extremely difficult to understand just what the attraction can be in this word "low." It were invidious to suggest comparison of the connotations of this word, the opposite of "high," with the latter's glorious connotations. but in "low" churchmanship there is no suggestion of an oriflamme, of a standard raised, no glory, no noble appeal—in short, no romance. At best, being "low" in churchmanship is a negative position, a set of opinions calling loudly for explanations, for an apologetic. And that apologetic has never been written. Save for fulminations against the "high" based on inconclusive evidence that those so denominated were betraying the Church over to an alien government, and hugely suggestive of panic, and a somewhat nervous sense of fellowship enforced with the broad and hazy, there is no appreciable platform for lowness in the Anglican Communion.

Nevertheless much is to be said for low and lazy individuals. Their laziness is not always of the sitting-and-taking-it-easy kind. Probably the laziness of the "low" today would better be described as an unwillingness to learn how to do things for God, a laziness with respect to

methods. For the "low," like the "high," are believers. So far as their laziness is an intellectual quality, it consists in the complacency with which they hold to the opinions and convictions involved in the Christian Faith, and their inability or unwillingness to put that faith into practice. I have in mind the case of a very prominent Low churchman who answered in the public press some years ago certain attacks upon the Anglican Communion which had been given great prominence and which emanated from a foreign papist at large in this country and coruscating mightily about Henry VIII, Anglican Orders, and other similar controversial matters. The reply was crushing and effective. The learned Paulist was silenced and well silenced, but to accomplish this desideratum the prominent "low" churchman had to write from the "high" standpoint throughout and use "high" arguments. This he did with commendable thoroughness, although he had to leave his work on the Prayer Book Papers Committee to do it. Then he went back to his work on his Prayer Book Papers, a series of publications aimed against the "high" in his own communion, and based upon a point of view which even the Paulist could not have used because it would have been inexplicable to him as a man of some learning, and doubtless an adequate knowledge of the Christian Faith and what that involves.

The "broad" and hazy have somewhat outgrown their haziness. They are, as it were, a group of persons going through a fog. They started from a clear bit of weather into the fog, and were well in when the author of the jingle described them. They are emerging today, but they are coming out on the other side of the bank of fog. The Broad churchman today dislikes the Christian Religion, and seeks to substitute for it something else of his own invention.

The haziness which characterizes him today is the haziness which grows out of a lack of partisan unity, but that haze too is clearing off. The "broad" is getting quite clear in his mind what it is that he wants to substitute for the Christian Religion. This is a kind of complex emulsion which is very pleasant to his taste. It has no very definite taste, for there are too many ingredients, and, being an emulsion, it has to be constantly shaken, lest it resolve itself into its elements again and cease to please the "broad." This shaking process keeps those called "broad" very busy indeed. The emulsion has many ingredients, each purporting to be "Christian," and the "broad" wants to include the "low" and leave out the "high." He is certain that the traditional laziness of the one will cause it to emulsify beautifully, and equally positive that the craziness of the other would make lumps in his pleasant emulsion which he agitates so energetically and sniffs so agreeably.

As in the original little rhyme, it may easily be seen that the High and the Low are contiguous, and the Low and the Broad are contiguous. Laziness and haziness mingle more or less easily, since haziness readily absorbs laziness. Craziness and laziness do not mix so easily. In the nature of the terms, craziness must dominate laziness, because since anything will dominate that which is lazy, and as craziness is a very active quality, *a fortiori* laziness, the attribute of the "low," must yield. It is an axiom. The question which concerns all three is: Shall the lazy yield to the crazy or to the hazy? The latter is a process about which the lazy need take no thought. They can be enveloped in the haze of that emulsion without any effort, and that way many of them are drifting, since, being lazy, they have little vitality by themselves. But the former would be a stimulating process. It is just that element of fanaticism

which involves hard work and self-sacrifice which would mould the easy-going "lows" into something with fibre, which would electrify a rather spineless school into something that God could use and that God would want to use. And it would be too bad if the "lows" should be too lazy to see this before they are entirely absorbed into the emulsion, for those of them who remain with us believe in the Christian Religion (even though they may not practice it all) just as do the crazy and just as the hazy do not.

In one respect, it is a very good thing for us Anglicans that Pius IX, of fragrant memory, condemned our orders so emphatically. For the Roman controversialist, *quaerens quem devoret*, is thus substantially estopped from using his best argument against us, i. e., that although we have every appanage of a Catholic Church, we vitiate our position by not putting these to any perceptible use, or, rather, that we have no inherent unity of usage and conduct. Of course, if we have no orders in the Catholic sense, we have nothing; we do not exist as a Church, and the ground is cut from under the feet of the Roman controversialist. And this official Roman view, the hazy, while professing to dislike Rome and alleging that the crazy are Rome's Anglican adherents, asserts himself, specifically, whenever—and it is often—he belittles the orders and standing of his own communion as a valid part of the Church Universal. In this view, the lazy, while he is too lazy to assert it, seemingly acquiesces, whenever—and it is almost always—he lists himself as indistinguishable from one of the Protestant Denominations save for our incomparable liturgy.

It remains for the "high"—and crazy—to hold up the standard of his faith; to assert, in spite of multiform antagonisms without and insidious treachery within, hazily originated, the truth of his position by his conduct. And

because he is crazy,—a fanatic for God, and not merely respectable and lazy, or hazily machinating,—he succeeds; he grows like a great tree, although he was no larger than the mustard seed not so very long ago.

Is it too much to hope that overcoming his laziness and using the faith that is truly in him, the “low” may awaken out of his sleep, and, bestirring himself to gain that certain fanaticism which accomplishes God’s results, escape the ultimate entombment of dissolution in a constantly agitated emulsion?

The Inner Life of the Clergy

BY THE REV. EDWIN G. WHITE.

THE first question we must ask as we think of ourselves and our inner life—our life apart from our outward activities, is—Why are we ministers at all? What is our motive? What was the cause of our entrance into this pursuit? No doubt it is still possible to enter from mixed motive; but there is nothing today in this calling which appeals from a worldly standpoint. Was it not because we believed God Himself had called us, that we had a vocation, that we were to be set apart as “ministers” or servants of the flock of God—that we were to be pastors or shepherds under the great Master Shepherd? This of course implies leadership—the leadership of the one who steps ahead. It is leadership in religion. It is not the leadership of the “great ones of the earth,” bringing with it much praise and subservience (how much we need to watch against the subtle temptation of looking for praise and of being hurt when we hear ourselves criticized instead of eulogized). We must ever be stepping ahead in holiness, in knowledge of God, in suffering, if need be, for Him, and in witnessing for the

truth. Therefore it is very necessary that our inner life should be entirely controlled by the Holy Spirit, and that we should use such means as will best fit us for our work. For we are constantly before our people, who look to us as examples—we must be with them in their sorrows and help them in times of trial and temptation. Truly we say “Who is sufficient for these things?” But we know “our sufficiency is of God.” This being so, we must in the first place be “converted men”—i. e. those who have turned to God, and continually turn to Him in penitence and trust. We must have taken our stand at the Cross of Christ and found in the blessed Saviour our Master and Lord. Otherwise, though we may be successful from a worldly point of view of religious work, we can never be true pastors and lead souls into peace. The burden of souls is very heavy, and the responsibility of the one called to be a shepherd is extremely great. We know the awful punishment awaiting those who are false to the trust committed to them. Like our Lord, we must say, “For their sakes I sanctify myself.”

We may for convenience divide our inner life into four parts:

1. Our private devotional life.
2. Our intellectual life.
3. Our habits.
4. Our temperament.

I am in no sense a psychologist and may be breaking all scientific rules in my divisions—my endeavor is to present the matter in a simple, everyday manner.

1. Our devotional life. We are Christian ministers, and however much we may differ in regard to our views of what Christianity is, I feel sure we all believe in prayer, and preach to our people the necessity of continual com-

munion with God in prayer. This demands that we be men of prayer. Besides leading the prayers of the congregation we must live a life of prayer ourselves. The Church of England requires all her clergy (unless something very important interferes) to say daily Morning and Evening Prayer. Those who follow this rule find it a great help, for these offices provide a regular and ordered reading of the Psalms and Old and New Testament; and prayers for the common, daily needs. Undoubtedly you all in your various ways have a regular daily season of prayer. If not, let me beg you to begin now. I mean of course something more than prayers on rising and retiring, something which we do as ministers, bearing up to God our parish and people. But we need more than this. We need to spend time in earnest prayer. Prayer is hard work. Which of us has not tried to pray—say for fifteen minutes—how hard it has been! We have had to exercise our will, our imagination, our conscience, our affections, and bend our whole being on God. Those who use a book with suggestions of subjects for intercession know what a help it is. Best of all, a private intercession book as part of our stock in trade, used systematically for years. Who can tell the gains in all departments of work when the pastor is known and felt to be a man of prayer?

With prayer goes the devotional use of the Holy Scripture. However some may regard that which all the Christian ages have considered Holy Writ, myriads have found in its pages messages of life and peace. The most helpful exercise for the day is the half-hour spent in meditation on some passage of Scripture. First—on your knees realize the presence of God—invoke the guidance of His Holy Spirit, read the verse or verses, think of it when first spoken—think of it as a message for today—consider your

own life and its bearing upon it. Make a resolution for the future and close with a prayer for strength and of thanksgiving. Thus your soul will grow. But our devotional life finds its center in our blessed Lord. We think of St. Peter as his Master tests him after his second conversion: "Lovest thou Me?" He requires the very highest devotion—"He that loveth father or mother more than Me is not worthy of Me." It is passion for Him which has inspired the great army of saints and martyrs who from the beginning have followed the Cross. And we are Christ's men—His ministers (servants or slaves). Because of our love for Him the Gospels will be our constant study; we shall wish to see Him, to follow His steps day by day, to hear His words and to learn of Him.

Personally I want continually to worship Him and receive Him in the Holy Communion, and as a priest it is my tremendous privilege and responsibility to celebrate the Holy Eucharist every Lord's Day at least. My brethren, the center of our devotional life must be Jesus Christ if we would be true ministers. And the more we set our hearts on Him, the less we shall be disturbed by the things which are otherwise the most fruitful causes of vexation. What does it matter if the world despises us? We have Him. What matter that our field is small, and we are poor? He knows and all is well.

II. The intellectual life. God has given us minds, and those minds we have consecrated to Him. This does not mean we are to neglect them; on the contrary, we must develop them. We are obliged to study for our sermons and the various classes we teach. And we should do more; we should try to have a definite scheme of reading, to be in touch with the thought of our times, and that we may the more readily meet the needs of the day in our work with

souls. I have a rule which requires me to spend at least three hours a week in the study of theology in addition to the regular meditation and reading of Holy Scripture in the daily offices. The common failing of today which makes our holy religion a sort of philosophy—as though it were merely a matter of thought and debate—of ethics and nothing more, is to be guarded against. It is very easy to become intellectualists at the expense of our spiritual power and to the detriment of our people. While we need to be armed at every point, and hence have our minds prepared, our purpose is not to be simply intellectual giants. We must see to it that study, which perhaps we love, does not oust us from prayer. Then, too, we must be careful what we study. There are some subjects, like some things, which we only touch at peril to our souls. St. Paul's rule should be ours in regard to our intellectual life. "Whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honorable, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report; if there be any virtue, and if there be any praise, think on these things."

III. Our habits. As Christian ministers we are servants of a great master and our office is of first importance. This should result in a desire for real efficiency, a striving to be always at our best. Nothing which will in any way weaken us for fulfilling our task must be allowed in our lives; anything which does so is sin. Therefore any indulgence which lessens our usefulness must be very sternly dealt with. I know I am treading on dangerous ground, and with no intention of judging another; but it is a serious fact that many good and earnest ministers are injuring their health, deadening their powers, hurting their friends, setting a bad example to the boys and young men who look

up to them as leaders, by devotion to tobacco. I confess to loving it myself, and longing for it; but I feel convinced it would be sin to again allow myself to enjoy it. Are the people edified by the spectacle so often witnessed, of the clergy at their meetings (and this applies particularly to those of the Protestant Episcopal division) smoking at the church door? And the workingman goes by to his toil despising them as "lazy loafers." Or imagine the minister's study reeking of tobacco, and the effect on the one who calls to talk over matters pertaining to his or her soul and to unburden a conscience laden with sin. Think of tobacco-stained fingers administering the Blessed Sacrament! You may consider me a fanatic—perhaps I am. But for the sake of our Master, let us seek to be the best we can be. I admit there are other things, and some worse by far. Above all, the minister must be pure in word and deed.

Another matter which comes under this head is care of our time. We are usually our own masters. It is very easy for us to be idle, and our work to suffer; or to spend time on our private affairs which should be expended on our parish. How often are we tempted to neglect certain parish calls and give the time to a book we want to read or to something which is purely for ourselves. We can best overcome this natural tendency by seeing that we give at least eight hours solid work each day to our parish. I know the majority of us give more. One good rule is to avoid sitting in public places reading or lounging during the hours when men generally are at work, for it leads to much unfavorable criticism, and does harm to the Body of Christ.

Further, we should do well to practice self-denial as a habit, remembering the earthly poverty of our Lord. If we want something quite proper in itself, let us make a sacri-

fice and do without it as an act of devotion to Him. Think what it means if the minister loudly argues for his rights, while the layman quietly submits to some injustice! How often would I have given anything had I remained silent in public when some little inconvenience has been caused me. Let us always practice self-control and show others that we follow Him who "pleased not Himself."

IV. Our temperament. The minister, like other good men, is liable to an attack of indigestion—but he must be careful to see that his dyspepsia does not affect his dealings with others. Gruff, censorious manners on the part of a clergyman are inexcusable. We must always seek to cultivate a warm, gentle, sympathetic disposition, in order to make people feel at ease in our presence, and able to be at their best. Let us avoid discussion of the affairs of others and try to be men of few words. Let us be careful lest we bore others by constantly talking religion — at the same time we must know when to say the word in season. No person is more insufferable than the smug, ranting individual who presses his religious views on everyone he meets. Let us always practice hospitality, welcoming people into our homes and making them feel that we are glad to entertain them. The minister should never get the reputation of being "stingy" or "close"—yet, on the other hand, he must watch against display, waste and extravagance. The ideal Christian minister is a gentleman in the real sense of the word; courteous, dignified, thoughtful for others and displaying the love of Christ in all he does. We should be ready to serve and nothing should be "a trouble." The minister usually is not generally popular, sometimes, alas! through his own fault, but frequently because he is regarded as he has been pictured by novelists and play-

wrights, who usually make him an object of ridicule. It is our business to show the falsity of these caricatures by our lives. We have two difficulties against which to contend: first, that some speak and act as though we were immaculate and extremely "good," and the second that others misunderstand us, holding us at arm's length. Against all this we have to persevere, spurred on by the love of Christ and helped by God the Holy Ghost, seeking to set before all men "Jesus Christ and Him crucified." By His help may we be faithful to the end!

BOOK REVIEWS

The Kingdom that Must be Built. By Walter J. Carey, M.A., R.N. Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. London, 1918.

One of the best things about this book by Fr. Carey is its accuracy of theological statement (credit for which faculty of his is gracefully given in the dedication). Being confident, then, by past experience, of careful writing and good theology, we welcome the treatment of this theme—the practical consideration of religion in the Anglican Communion after the war. It is a pleasure to read Fr. Carey, after so much that has been published has proved banal and unorthodox.

The author, as a wise thinker and a priest who knows men's souls, begins with the very foundations of belief: "Most men either believe in, or are curious about, a higher Power." Of the supposed difficulty of believing in God in war-time: "Besides, I do not think that God's principal wish is to keep us alive. To maintain in being the largest number of fat, cowardly, self-indulgent people does not seem a very divine task." Combined with the greatest sympathy and insight, we find some wholesome blunt truths. Of our Lord he says, "this life written down, totally uninventable—we think—by fools or frauds." "He was executed for blasphemy because He made Himself equal with God!" "The world has no interest in God—no responsibility to God, and therefore no sense of sin or need of salvation." The so-called "moral sense" of society is termed "pagan toleration"; "men only respect a standard which would be equally valid if Christ wasn't true or didn't exist." Of prayer, "it is an act of self-surrender to the purposes of God." Again, "We trust God not to give us any of our requests which—if granted—would only hinder His large purposes or injure us." Many fine things are said of sacramental grace; for example, "To pacifists and neutrals in the great warfare between good and evil, sacraments will mean little except mysticism and emotionalism." And, "Absolution heals his wounds and puts him back into the fighting-line again."

Fr. Carey's ideals are constructive and must be read in their context to be appreciated. We would wish that our clergy might all read this book, for it is not dull; it is inspiring. The kingdom that must be built is no mere selfish and personal delight in religion, leaving "the world to stew in its own juice"; but the uplifting of "a world to the end and voca-

tion for which He has destined it." In a word, "He wants lovers and workers, not paralytic pietists."

The English printing of the book before us is rather better than the American edition. It is quite the best post-bellum treatise yet to appear; in fact, it is hard to imagine anything better in its line. It would be a splendid thing if our reading laymen could have it brought to their notice.

P. R. F.

The Orthodox Greek Church. By the Rev. Constantine Callinicos, B.D. New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1918.

This little volume is a good summary of the history, doctrine and worship of the Greek Church. The author, who has lived in England for years, has learned to know just what the clergy and laity of our Communion want to be told about his Church; and he gives this information in a very brief compass. A perusal of the little book, which will not take more than an hour, will give the reader a fair idea of the great Eastern Branch of the Church Catholic. All the essentials are given; and the author fully accomplishes his purpose of introducing us to our great sister, more and more of whose children are constantly coming to our shores. The closing chapter on Orthodoxy and Anglicanism is rather disappointing. We learn nothing of the Greek point of view as to reunion. The few incidents given are of minor importance. The only point on which he dwells at all is the fact that Theodore of Tarsus was Archbishop of Canterbury in the seventh century of our era.

F. C. H. W.

A Little Book for Mothers and Sons. By Nora B. Thornhill. Longmans.

This contains short daily religious readings for mothers and sons during seven holiday weeks. We should like to think that mothers often held such conversations with their little boys. If not, they can find here simple, wholesome teaching of the Christian virtues. It would be a useful gift-book to many mothers.

W. H. B.

A Library of Religion. By the Rev. A. C. Deane, M.A., Hon. Canon of Worcester. Morehouse Publishing Co.

There is no lack of interest in religion today, but an enormous need of sound information about it. So the average citizen, whose library is

behind the times, will be glad to learn how he may acquire a tolerable collection of 70 volumes of first-rate religious literature for an outlay of six pounds—say thirty dollars—if the books can be bought in this country at the low prices quoted.

The author certainly gives the money's worth in his well chosen list of standard writings of many different kinds, Biblical, historical, and miscellaneous, besides many volumes of sermons of acknowledged merit, which many a priest would love to possess. We should like to think that some of our more intelligent Church-people will read and follow the author's advice in this suggestive little work.

W. H. B.

"Back to Christ." By the Rev. H. T. Knight, M.A. Oxford University Press.

This is the first of a series of Handbooks for the People under the title of the Church's Message for the Coming Time. If the other volumes are equal to this they will present a valuable interpretation of the Church's Message.

In a changing age the world itself sees in Jesus Christ the One Foundation, the Centre and Focus of Christianity. The Romanist pleads that the New Testament cannot be rightly appreciated apart from the ecclesiastical tradition which lies behind it, while the Protestant contends that the authority of the Church requires to be balanced by the authority of the Bible. The attitude of the Christian Society is ever onward and upward, as well as backward, to find a permanent record of Apostolic teaching.

Part 2 on the Historical Basis of Catholicity is particularly good, and contains in small compass a lucid and very interesting survey of the New Testament Canon and of Early Church History.

For both brevity and scholarship this book should appeal to the clergy and to the laity.

W. H. B.

The Revelation of John. By Charles C. Whiting. Boston: Richard G. Badger.

The preface to this little volume tells us that the author has attempted "to reach an interpretation . . . that will be reasonable, in accord with modern scholarship, and at the same time so simple that the ordinary layman will find it easily within his grasp." He has had considerable